



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 21, 2005

No. 83

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Miss McMORRIS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 21, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CATHY McMORRIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 25 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate extend beyond 9:50 a.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BARRETT) for 2 minutes.

GOING FORWARD TO VICTORY IN IRAQ

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, we have been talking a lot about Iraq, and a lot of people have different ideas and different thoughts about what we are doing over there. In recent days and weeks, some have suggested we need a specific timeline or date that indicates when our troops will begin to withdraw from Iraq.

I would like to read an e-mail that one of my staffers received at the end of last week from a friend of hers currently serving in Iraq. The soldier says: "I know there are growing doubts, questions and concerns by many regarding our presence here and how long we should stay. For what it is worth, the attachment hopefully tells you why we are trying to make a positive difference in this country's future."

This is the attachment, Madam Speaker, and a picture truly is worth 1,000 words.

The soldier went on to say in ending his e-mail: "I hope to head home in 80 days with a feeling that I contributed something and made this world a better place for these guys."

Madam Speaker, any date for withdrawal would be arbitrary. We must allow our plan to go forward and not abandon it halfway through. This is not just about their future, it is about the future of all of us. Let us not talk about an exit strategy; let us talk about victory.

CONTINUING FUNDING OF PUBLIC BROADCASTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, as we watch the ebb and flow here in Washington, DC, the controversies, the complexities, there has never been a more important time for the thought-provoking service that is supplied by Public Broadcasting. The educational, cultural and community awareness, together with the politics and policy formats, form the framework for citizens to cope with the myriad of challenges and demands of today's modern living, much as we are struggling with them here in Washington, DC.

If there has never been a more important time for public broadcasting,

there has never been a worse time for Congress to be part of a campaign against public broadcasting. We formed the Public Broadcasting Caucus 5 years ago here on Capitol Hill to help promote the exchange of ideas surrounding public broadcasting, to help equip staff and Members of Congress to deal with the issues that surround that important service.

There are complexities in areas of legitimate disagreement and technical matters, make no mistake about it, and our caucus is a great platform for Congress to explore these items and to be heard by the various public broadcasting constituencies, their boards and staff.

Cutting funding, especially the proposals from the subcommittee, are the worst approach in dealing with public broadcasting. President Bush has requested over \$413 million in his budget for fiscal year 2006. The subcommittee has recommended that that be slashed to \$300 million, cutting by almost %, this year's funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and eliminating entirely the President's \$23 million request for Ready-To-Learn.

Madam Speaker, these are as draconian as they are unjustified. Every week, 82 million people demonstrate the worth of public broadcasting by viewing public television and over 30 million people a week listen to NPR.

But the cuts are not only cutting at the fabric of the programming; they will devastate small rural markets that are hard to serve without the extra resources provided by the Federal Government. Larger metropolitan areas will be hurt as well. The area that I represent in Oregon will suffer about a 25 percent cut, but ultimately they will still have some service. In many small rural areas, public broadcasting, which is expensive to provide, is likely to disappear altogether, because the sparsely populated communities are not able to make up the gap.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4805

The good news is that the public outcry is being heard. Already the full committee has voted to reverse its decision to completely eliminate the advanced funding for fiscal year 2008. That reversal is an important step to provide certainty and continuity, to give a hint of stability for Public Broadcasting and keeping our commitments.

There will be an amendment to reverse the \$100 million rescission for fiscal 2006, and I strongly support that effort. In the meantime, I would urge my colleagues to become involved with the public broadcasting issues, to join over 100 other Members of Congress who are members of the Public Broadcasting Caucus and engage in its activities. It is important to show the same bipartisan support for public broadcasting as we have in other controversial matters in recent weeks. The American public deserves no less.

RECOGNIZING THE POSITIVE IMPLICATIONS OF CAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 1 minute.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, it is critical for us to recognize the positive, far-reaching implications of CAFTA.

CAFTA is not solely about trade, it is about lives. It is about promoting U.S. national security objectives in our own backyard. By strengthening our allies, our neighboring countries, we are helping to strengthen our own efforts to fight the scourge of terrorism. Free markets and economic development are the best weapons against tyranny, against poverty and against disease.

CAFTA will promote democratic governance, thus advancing stability and consolidating freely-elected governments who are allies in the war against drugs and the War on Terror. Failure to pass CAFTA in Congress will cripple our efforts to freeze out narco-terrorist gangs and others who threaten our national security.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support CAFTA. A vote for CAFTA is a vote for our U.S. national security interests.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 9 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, Your love is consistent and deep. You must have a way of remaining in love with us, even when we neglect Your presence or disobey Your commands. Otherwise, how could You forgive us so readily and always hope for our deeper conversion of heart.

Be present to the Members of the House of Representatives and all who work for this noble institution today. Hold out a strong hand to those who are weak or fainthearted. Be patient with the bold and the arrogant.

By Your Spirit, enable all to be patient, forgiving, and understanding to one another so they may be ready to receive the same gracious gifts from You in the same measure they have treated others.

You alone are the lasting judge of all, and the full measure of goodness to which no other can be compared, for You are Lord, both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. McNULTY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF OUR TROOPS

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, over 9 million innocent human beings were killed in the Nazi death camps. Over 3 million were killed in the Soviet gulags under Joseph Stalin. Over 1.5 million were killed by the Khmer Rouge under Pol Pot in Cambodia.

And how many have been killed at Guantanamo Bay? Zero.

But that has not stopped a Democratic leader, a Democratic Senator, and the Democratic Party from drawing parallels between what is happening in Guantanamo and the horrors of Hitler or Stalin or Pol Pot.

That message belies the suffering of the victims of those terrible atrocities. That message discourages our brave men and women in uniform, when na-

tional leaders compare their actions to those of the Nazis. That kind of rhetoric incites our enemies and hinders our efforts in the war on terror.

I challenge every Democratic leader to denounce these ridiculous comparisons. Show our enemies that we are united in our actions against terror, and show our troops that we honor their service.

CONGRATULATING SECRETARY OF STATE CONDOLEEZA RICE FOR STANDING UP FOR DEMOCRACY

(Mr. EMANUEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMANUEL. Madam Speaker, I would like to congratulate Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice for standing up for democratic principle, for finally saying what needed to be said. During a speech in Cairo yesterday, Secretary Rice criticized Middle East leaders for failing to encourage democracy.

My colleagues in this Chamber know well that when I disagree with this administration, I let my opinion be known. I disagree with their proposals for Social Security, their stewardship of the economy, their plan for the Iraq war and occupation, and how they treat critics. Yet, on advocating Middle East Democracy, I do not disagree. I agree with the Secretary of State and her comments.

Unfortunately, when it comes to our allies in the Middle East, America too often turns a blind eye to their failings of leadership. We rightfully denounce countries with repressive regimes like those in Iran and Syria, but others such as Egypt and Saudi Arabia receive a pass.

Yesterday, Secretary Rice spoke up on behalf of America; she represented the best of American ideals and our steadfast belief in basic human rights and democracy. This will serve America well as we battle for the hearts and minds of the Muslim world.

Madam Speaker, I do not often agree with this administration, but I know a good thing when I see it. When it comes to democracy and all that comes with democracy, no one gets a pass.

LEAVE A GOOD LEGACY: STOP CLONING NOW

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, every Member of this body is mindful of his or her legacy, and that is good.

There is an issue facing this Nation that should cause us all to consider that legacy carefully. The issue is human cloning, and it is closer to reality than we think. We learned that from Korean scientists last month, but we have the ability to stop it here in America before it is too late.

So Members of this body should ask themselves, Do you want your legacy

to be that we stood by as scientists started cloning human beings in America? Members leaving this body after next year should ask, Do you want to tell your grandkids some day that you had a chance to act to stop cloning but did nothing?

If we do nothing, Madam Speaker, cloning will come, and this Congress will be judged not by job numbers or a national energy plan or highway dollars, but by our failure to stop human cloning. I do not want that on my conscience; no one does, but our lack of action will make us responsible for its arrival.

Let us leave a good legacy, a legacy that guards the uniqueness of life. Let us act to stop human cloning.

UNDERMINING OF AMERICAN VALUES

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, the Bush administration and Republican leaders are engaged in a pathetic attempt to make Senator DICK DURBIN's condemnation of the use of torture at Guantanamo Bay an issue.

As a result of the revelations of conditions at Guantanamo, Abu Ghraib, the Bagram Prison in Afghanistan, the Republicans owe the American people, our soldiers, and veterans an apology for undermining American values such as the rule of law, for putting our troops at greater risk around the world, and for cutting veterans health benefits when they come home, and failing to provide our troops the equipment they need to protect themselves on the battlefield.

Clearly the Republicans are reading the polls and watching their approval as well as the approval for the misguided war plummet. So in a desperate attempt to shift the blame, they want to shoot the messenger.

Everyone knows what Senator DURBIN meant, and he was right. The United States of America stands for the rule of law, not for torture. It is this administration and the Republican leaders, certainly not our soldiers and not Senator DURBIN, who has tarnished the image of our great country.

THE REAL GUANTANAMO BAY

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise today in response to the ill-timed and ill-conceived remarks by the Democratic Senator. The Senator's deplorable comparison of American servicemen and women at Guantanamo Bay to Nazi Soviet gulags and to Pol Pot are injurious to our military and provide a propaganda victory to our enemy.

Sadly, the words of this United States Senator now serve to give aid and comfort to Islamic terrorists. The senior Senator from Illinois seems to

have taken poetic license with whatever document he has failed to produce as evidence of his allegations.

The brave men and women of America's military put their lives on the line each day to meet the demands of Gitmo's prisoners. These al Qaeda and Taliban detainees are being treated consistent with the principles of the Geneva Conventions and, most importantly, yet seemingly overlooked by some Democrats, consistent with military necessity.

Intelligence gained at Gitmo has and will continue to prevent terrorist attacks and help save American lives. I am hopeful that certain Democratic Senators will quit being a part of the problem and start being part of the solution.

Because of Gitmo, the U.S. is learning organizational structure of terrorist groups, the extent of terrorist presence in the world, Al Qaeda's pursuit of WMDs, methods of recruitment and location of centers, terrorist skillsets, and how seemingly legitimate financial operations are used to disguise and fund terrorist operations.

GUANTANAMO BAY

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, recent comments alleging mistreatment of prisoners at Guantanamo are not only insulting, they are wrong.

The 545 prisoners being interrogated at Guantanamo are properly housed and fed, they receive medical care, and have their religious needs met.

A U.S. Senator made statements last week that were clearly imprudent and unwise, comparing treatment of detainees to acts of genocide and repression. Millions of people died in the camp cited by the Senator, and no one has died at Guantanamo. While American troops are busy attacking and defeating terrorism, our tax dollars are providing Korans, prayer rugs, and healthy meals to the terrorist prisoners at Guantanamo. It is not Pol Pot at Guantanamo, it is pot roast. To purport that there is a moral equivalency between the acts of dictatorial madmen of the 20th century and the treatment of detainees at Guantanamo does a disservice to history, to our national honor, and to each member of our military who risk their lives every day preserving the privileges we enjoy.

I call on the Senator to talk to the guards at Guantanamo and get the facts straight. Then he should apologize to them, to the rest of our soldiers, and to the American people.

REPUBLICANS ATTEMPT TO DIVERT ATTENTION AWAY FROM WAR IN IRAQ

(Mr. BUTTERFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, these attacks against the gentlewoman from California (Leader PELOSI) and Senator DURBIN are nothing more than an attempt by the congressional Republicans to divert attention away from the war in Iraq to comments made by two of our Democratic colleagues.

Republicans know that the war in Iraq is not going well right now. They have an administration that is clearly not leveling with the American people. Earlier this month, Vice President CHENEY told a national audience that the insurgency in Iraq was in its last throes. Well, we all know that is not the case.

I think Washington columnist Richard Cohen got it right this morning when he wrote that these partisan attacks are the latest in a series of attacks by Washington Republicans to silence the opposing views. Cohen wrote, "The contempt the Bush administration has shown for world opinion and international law, not to mention American traditions of jurisprudence, is costing us plenty. We are not the Soviet Union, and we are not Nazi Germany, and DICK DURBIN did not intend to say we are. His detractors have to know that. Their intention, however, is not to answer criticism, but to silence a critic."

Democrats will not be silenced.

ONE WEEK LATER AND STILL NO APOLOGY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, the people of Illinois and the United States are rightfully concerned about the recent smear and slander made by Democrat Whip Senator DICK DURBIN.

After Democrat Whip DURBIN likened U.S. troops to murderous dictators, columnist John Kass of the Chicago Tribune called on Senator DURBIN to apologize to the Nation for his irresponsible and dangerous comments. Kass wrote, "Hitler, Stalin and Pol Pot murdered roughly 50 million people. At Guantanamo, suspected terrorists have been made uncomfortable, including a minion of Osama bin Laden's, but I haven't heard of anyone being killed there. We're at war, Senator."

The people of Illinois deserve a Senator who accurately represents their strong appreciation for the men and women who bravely serve our country at home and abroad. Democrat Whip DURBIN made his reckless comments almost a week ago, and he has still not apologized for his comments. As the second ranking Democrat in the U.S. Senate, DURBIN should take responsibility for his comments and immediately apologize to the U.S. troops and American families. I am grateful my son served in Iraq.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must remind Members that remarks in debate may not engage in personalities towards Senators.

NOW IS THE TIME TO ENACT HUMAN CLONING BAN

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, human cloning is coming. Despite ominous developments in South Korea and in laboratories across the land, last week, the House Committee on Appropriations rejected, by a narrow margin, a thoughtful amendment authored by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON). The Weldon cloning amendment would essentially prohibit any entity, institution, private or public, from receiving NIH funds if that entity engages in human cloning for research or reproductive purposes.

While that amendment failed, human cloning continues to advance, and the breakthrough in this unethical and morally questionable science is around the corner.

Now is the time for Congress to act. On two separate occasions, Congress has enacted the Weldon-Stupak cloning ban by a 60 percent-plus bipartisan majority. And the time is now, after last week's disappointing vote in the Committee on Appropriations, with the Labor-HHS bill headed to the floor, now is the time, this summer, to once again bring a human cloning ban to the floor and enacted into law.

LET US SEE FOR OURSELVES AT GUANTANAMO BAY

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, I was a former judge. I saw jails, I saw prisons. I saw numerous prisons and jails. Now we hear about this torture chamber down in Guantanamo Bay. Some people call it Gitmo. Well, I think we ought to "Gitmo" information, information about Guantanamo.

The statements made by our colleagues down the hallway are uninformed, irrational, and totally irresponsible.

I ask this person who says this torture chamber down in Gitmo is uninhabitable, well, I will ask you, what did you have for breakfast this morning? Was it pancakes with syrup, fresh fruit, and coffee? Oatmeal, scrambled eggs, orange juice or cranberry juice; your choice?

□ 1015

Well, that is what those Guantanamo Bay prisoners had for breakfast today. Meanwhile, American troops in Iraq

and Afghanistan, what are they eating? They are eating C-rations out of cans. We know that the prisoners in Guantanamo Bay have actually gained weight.

It sounds like the characterizations to this and Nazi prisoner of war camps are irresponsible. So I invite the good Senator to go with me to Guantanamo Bay, and let us GITMO information about his place and let us go down and check it out firsthand before more comments are made.

Meanwhile, apologies need to be made to American troops overseas.

GITMO

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, over the past week, we have watched as those across the aisle, led by Minority Leader PELOSI and Senator DURBIN, made comments regarding our troops, our war on terror, and our operations at Guantanamo Bay. Apparently, to some in this body, America can do nothing right.

But I want Americans to remember that months ago, these people who are now calling Iraq and the war on terror a disaster were declaring that the elections would not be a total success, that they would be a failure. Now, are these folks seeking success, or are they seeking failure?

The critics today say they hate Guantanamo Bay. Do we want to be running Guantanamo Bay? No. But you know what, we have to remember, there are people who would like to murder Americans by the thousands. Have we forgotten September 11?

We cannot sanction their homelands because they do not operate as part of a national military. Thus we are forced to run Guantanamo Bay. Americans get captured by the terrorists and they are slaughtered, they are beheaded; and we have seen the photos. That is not what we do to the enemy combatants at Guantanamo, and the idea that the two can be compared is reprehensible.

SENATOR DURBIN'S COMMENTS

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, Senator DURBIN spoke for millions of Americans who are horrified and shocked about the treatment, the mistreatment of prisoners who have not been given the right to be notified of where they are, prisoners who were hung by their arms, who reported homicides, the scandals and the cover-ups.

Yes, these are dangerous people that are in these prisons. Many of them may be guilty of very serious crimes. But the fact of the matter is America cannot be a beacon for freedom and justice and liberty when it is doing it by abusing prisoners.

As Senator DURBIN said, if you have read these without knowing the country, you would be horrified because these are the practices that are associated with dictatorships and countries without the rule of law and countries of repression. The fact of the matter is, this administration should have an independent investigation of the treatment of prisoners in Afghanistan and Guantanamo Bay. They should do it immediately so that we do not continue to have these incidents become magnets for the recruitment of the insurgents.

If somebody is worried about our troops, maybe the Republicans and the President could apologize for sending them into battle without body armor, for sending them into battle without sufficient numbers to protect them, to send them in battle without properly armed Humvees, because that is what causes parents to grieve for the loss of their lives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF FARMHOUSE FRATERNITY, INC.

Miss McMORRIS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 207) recognizing the 100th anniversary of FarmHouse Fraternity, Inc.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 207

Whereas FarmHouse Fraternity, Inc. was founded on April 15, 1905, by 7 students from the College of Agriculture at the University of Missouri-Columbia;

Whereas FarmHouse Fraternity, Inc. is widely known and respected on college campuses throughout the United States and Canada as a fraternity that encourages values-based leadership, has a strong academic focus, and is dedicated to service;

Whereas FarmHouse Fraternity, Inc. focuses on building the whole man—intellectually, spiritually, socially, morally, and physically;

Whereas more than 24,000 men have been members of FarmHouse Fraternity, Inc., including governors, congressmen, top scientists, innovators in agriculture, university presidents, Nobel Prize winners, Pulitzer Prize winners, doctors, lawyers, and Hall of Fame athletes;

Whereas FarmHouse Fraternity, Inc. members volunteer countless hours of service each year to help improve the communities they serve; and

Whereas hundreds of FarmHouse Fraternity, Inc. alumni and student members will gather in Columbia, Missouri, from April 14 to April 17, 2005, for the celebration of the

100th anniversary of the fraternity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives recognizes the 100th anniversary of FarmHouse Fraternity, Inc. and commends the fraternity and its members for a century of service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Washington (Miss McMORRIS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington (Miss McMORRIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Miss McMORRIS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Miss McMORRIS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 207 offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF).

House Resolution 207 honors the FarmHouse Fraternity on the occasion of its 100th anniversary. The FarmHouse Fraternity was founded on April 15, 1905, by seven men from the College of Agriculture at the University of Missouri, Columbia, who acknowledged a need for recognition of a small, specialized group in the area of higher education.

Originally formed as an agricultural club, the FarmHouse Fraternity has become widely known and respected on college campuses throughout the United States and Canada as a fraternity that encourages value-based leadership, has strong academic focus, and is dedicated to service.

FarmHouse promotes the moral and intellectual welfare of its members and encourages social growth; loyalty among its members to their country, their community, their university, and their fraternity; and the well-rounded personality of members.

The FarmHouse Fraternity helps transform the young men of today into the leaders of tomorrow's world. More than 24,000 men have been members of the FarmHouse Fraternity, including Governors, Congressmen, top scientists, innovators in agriculture, university presidents, Noble Peace Prize winners, Pulitzer Prize winner, doctors, lawyers, and Hall of Fame athletes.

In addition, members of the FarmHouse Fraternity volunteer countless hours of service each year to help improve the communities they serve.

Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize and honor the FarmHouse Fraternity for the celebration of its 100th anniversary and commend the fraternity and its members for a cen-

tury of service and achievement. I urge my colleagues to help support House Resolution 207.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I stand in support of House Resolution 207, which recognizes the 100th anniversary of FarmHouse Fraternity, Incorporated. The organization was first founded by seven students from the College of Agriculture at the University of Missouri, Columbia. Currently, FarmHouse Fraternity has 24,000 members; and it continues to increase its membership on college campuses throughout the United States and Canada, notwithstanding the fact that today there are fewer farm families and fewer young men with the traditional agricultural background.

Farming issues today are much more complex than a century ago. In addition to concerns about the impact of drought and disease on crop production, farmers today must concern themselves with agricultural trade policies, competition from major foreign producers and exporters and agroterrorism.

While farming issues may have changed, the fraternity's objectives have remained constant. Today, just as in 1905, the fraternity still aims to promote good fellowship, encourage studiousness, and build character and integrity amongst its members.

I congratulate each of the members of FarmHouse Fraternity on their 100th anniversary and wish them continued success in the future.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Miss McMORRIS. Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF).

Mr. HULSHOF. Madam Speaker, I rise and ask my colleagues in the House to support this resolution. In addition to the kind words that already have been mentioned, FarmHouse had a unique, but a humble, beginning in my home town of Columbia, Missouri.

Like many social organizations at the University of Missouri campus, there were few students back in 1905 to draw from for its members. Its purpose, its objective back then was really not clearly defined or understood. And so it attracted little attention. It was not the result of any sort of a crisis among ag students, but was rather the result of a need for recognition of a small and subordinate and specialized group in the area of higher education.

The University of Missouri College of Agriculture was established back in 1870 as part of the land grant system. A lot of my colleagues here still to this day defend mightily the land grant system. It was a small division of the ag school back in 1905 within the University of Missouri. There were less than 100 students. It was not really held in

the same high regard or high esteem as the school of law or the school of medicine, and most of those students were all farm-reared boys.

But a rather close relationship developed among this group of 35, a lot of them attended the same class, everyone knew each other, and there developed among them this sense of camaraderie. So as an outgrowth of this fellowship and the friendships that were formed, there were three men, D. Howard Doane, Henry P. Rusk and Earl Rusk, who conceived this idea of forming an agricultural club in order to perpetuate this congenial association.

In fact, as history has it, at least as we tell it, they began to have this discussion on a Sunday afternoon at a YMCA Bible meeting. So it was desirable that they were going to make this group, and they proposed to rent a house and live together, and this was in the spring of 1905.

And from the diary of Mr. Doane comes the following record: "At the close of my freshman year, there was organized a club of farmers, principally from the freshman class, to run a clubhouse to be known as the FarmHouse. When school opened in September, only seven of the group returned."

I mentioned Mr. Doane and the two brothers Rusk, and the others that joined them were Robert F. Howard, Claude B. Hutchison, Henry H. Krusekopf, and Melvin E. Sherwin.

Back now to Mr. Doane's diary: "They took the house on their hands and turned it into a regular rooming and boarding house. Those seven fellows were the best bunch that ever got together. During the whole year they managed the house without one single disagreeable incident."

I am tempted to go into a parenthetical aside regarding this body, but I will choose not to do that. And then finally from Mr. Doane's diary: "Many a night this dear old bunch assembled with gravest doubts assailing them and wondering if it was all worth while."

Well, Mr. Doane, in the humble opinion of this FarmHouse alum, it was indeed worthwhile. Thirty chapters across the country, including Canada, with a list of notable alumni, including just a smattering of those: former Kansas Governor, John Carlin; George Beadle, who received a Noble Prize in medicine and genetics back in 1958; Pulitzer Prize winner Ezra George Thiem; and Hall of Fame athletes Ed Widseth from Minnesota and legendary Missouri Coach Don Faurot; 49 past national FFA officers; one former U.S. Secretary of Agriculture; and entertainers Leroy Van Dyke, Michael Martin Murphey, and Pat Green.

More than 24,000 men have become members of FarmHouse Fraternity. And while the others do not necessarily hold a title, each has made his own mark within the community and the family in which they live, putting into action the FarmHouse motto: "Builder of Men."

I was honored to be invited to speak to an event back in Columbia, Missouri, over 530 participants, back in April of this year. And I would ask that this body, that the House of Representatives today recognize the 100th anniversary of FarmHouse Fraternity and commend the fraternity and its members for a century of service.

Miss MCMORRIS. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Miss MCMORRIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 207.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE IN REMEMBRANCE OF BRAVE SERVICEMEN WHO PERISHED IN APRIL 24, 1980, RESCUE ATTEMPT OF AMERICAN HOSTAGES IN IRAN

Mr. SAXTON. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 256) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in remembrance of the brave servicemen who perished in the disastrous April 24, 1980, rescue attempt of the American hostages in Iran, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 256

Whereas on November 4, 1979, Islamic extremists occupied the United States Embassy in Tehran, Iran, and took 66 American hostages, of whom 13 were released in a matter of days, on November 19 and 20, 1979;

Whereas after months of unsuccessful diplomatic negotiations for the release of the remaining 53 hostages and after extensive planning and intergovernmental debate, a complex rescue mission designated as "Operation Eagle Claw" was approved by President Carter on April 16, 1980;

Whereas on April 24, 1980, a task force comprised of Army Special Operations Forces, Army Rangers, Air Force Special Operations Wing personnel, and United States Navy, Marine, and Air Force pilots succeeded in moving thousands of miles undetected until reaching a remote location in the Iranian desert 200 miles from Tehran designated by the code name "Desert One";

Whereas at Desert One, a combination of helicopters and MC-130/EC-130 gunships rendezvoused with the intention of rescuing the hostages 200 miles away in Tehran the following evening;

Whereas the bravery, dedication, and level of operational expertise of the men who participated in the mission were evident from the onset and tested by the mechanical and weather problems suffered en route to the rendezvous point;

Whereas due to mechanical failures and weather problems only six out of eight helicopters successfully arrived at the Desert One rendezvous;

Whereas six helicopters was the minimum number of helicopters that could successfully complete Operation Eagle Claw;

Whereas once the six helicopters arrived, the rescue attempt was dealt a final blow when it was learned that one of the helicopters had lost its primary hydraulic system and would be unsafe to use fully loaded for the final assault on Tehran;

Whereas as the various aircraft began moving into position to return to their respective launching points, one of the helicopters collided with a C-130 aircraft on the ground;

Whereas flames engulfed the helicopter and the C-130 and resulted in the death of 5 airmen and 3 Marines;

Whereas other members of the task force were burned but survived, while their comrades acted bravely in restoring order and managed to evacuate the wounded personnel and salvageable equipment back to friendly territory;

Whereas Members of Congress were dismayed with the poor equipment, lack of funding, and inattention that had been given to special operations forces up to that time that came to light because of the aborted rescue mission;

Whereas in response, legislation was enacted in 1986 to establish a new unified command for special operations forces that is designated as the United States Special Operations Command (USSOCOM);

Whereas the United States Special Operations Command continues to prove its immense value to the national defense as witnessed by the performance of special operations forces in Afghanistan, in Iraq, and in many other countries of the world; and

Whereas the Nation owes a great debt of gratitude to special operations forces personnel and their families: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the bravery, sacrifice, and patriotism of the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines who participated in Operation Eagle Claw in April 1980 in the attempt to rescue American hostages in Iran and particularly remembers the sacrifice of those who died in that attempt; and

(2) commends all special operations forces personnel currently in service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAXTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAXTON. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, to begin, let me extend my sincere gratitude and appreciation to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) for his assistance in bringing this resolution to the floor.

□ 1030

The men and women of our Armed Forces are fortunate to have such a dedicated person serving as chairman

of the Committee on Armed Services and I am deeply honored to serve with him.

Madam Speaker, on November 4, 1979, Americans were shocked by the news that terrorists had stormed our embassy in Tehran and took 66 of our fellow citizens hostage. This deplorable act of barbarism caught our Nation off guard and, frankly, ill-prepared to fully realize the growing threat in the region.

As days became weeks and weeks became months, back-channel diplomacy was failing. The American people were becoming impatient and a wide array of individuals were demanding action. As a Nation, the United States was being held hostage by a regime that had no intention of negotiating.

Finally, President Carter made the decision that enough was enough; it was time to bring our people home. On April 16, 1980 a plan called "Operation Eagle Claw" was approved, and our Nation's Special Operations Forces were prepared to answer the call.

Madam Speaker, 8 days later on April 24, a task force of highly trained personnel from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force was formed. The task force was comprised of highly trained individuals and intensely dedicated people, probably the most dedicated ever assembled to set forth on a mission that would end abruptly in disaster.

The plan called for 8 helicopters, 12 airplanes and a lethal combination of United States Army Special Operations Forces, Army Rangers, Air Force Special Operations Wing personnel, and United States Navy, Marine, and Air Force pilots to work without a unified command structure deep inside hostile territory, a daunting task.

The mission's first objective called for the task force to rendezvous at a location named Desert One. Once there, U.S. Special Forces combat controllers and translators were to be offloaded from Air Force airplanes, C-130s, and reloaded onto Navy helicopters which would take them to the outskirts of Tehran, in preparation for the final rescue.

Before the rendezvous could even take place, weather problems and mechanical failures plagued the mission. Eight helicopters took off from the USS Nimitz, but only 6, the bare minimum required to complete the mission successfully, successfully arrived at Desert One.

Once the birds were on the ground, Operation Eagle Claw received its final blow when one of the remaining helicopters' hydraulic system malfunctioned and therefore rendered the bird useless for the final assault on Tehran. At that point, despite the desired and sheer ability of the Special Operations Forces on the ground, the order to abort the mission was given.

As the helicopters and airplanes maneuvered to return to their respective launching points, another disaster struck. One of the helicopters collided

with a parked C-130 and both aircraft erupted in flames. In the chaos that followed, the soldiers on the ground acted courageously, with absolutely no regard for their personal safety, and managed to save many of their colleagues.

But despite this uncanny display of bravery, 8 of America's finest young men lost their lives: Captain Harold L. Lewis, Jr., Captain Lyn D. McIntosh, Captain Richard L. Baake, Captain Charles McMillan, Master Sergeant Joel C. Mayo, Staff Sergeant Dewey Johnson, Sergeant John D. Harvey, and Corporal George N. Holmes. They deserve our admiration and appreciation for the supreme sacrifice made on behalf of our country.

This morning, Madam Speaker, when I looked at my e-mail, I had received an e-mail from someone who read an op-ed which was published, which I wrote for the Washington Times, which was published yesterday. I would like to read it in part.

He says: I will never forget the day, as a young second lieutenant serving in the 82nd Air Force Division, across Fort Bragg from Special Forces Headquarters, we knew very little about the Special Forces people at that time, but I did know the leader's daughter. So in addition to recognizing that these were America's finest warriors with all the physical strength, hooah, and military skills one can imagine, I also appreciated that they had families who loved them dearly and who suffered anguish, fear, and loss in Eagle Claw. So that is what I recall from my 25 years ago and what I recall every day when I open the newspaper and read of the tremendous sacrifice our forces make, each of them with families who love them.

Madam Speaker, although the results of the mission were tragic, Operation Eagle Claw's contribution to the American military was invaluable. One of the central recommendations made by the investigative commission called upon the military commanders and policy makers to look at ways to bring together various Special Operations Forces of each branch of the military. This crucial observation led to the creation of the United States Special Operations Command, SOCOM, a model of jointness that serves as an example of the transformed 21st century military which we are seeking to help create.

Today, SOCOM officers and soldiers and others who are serving our Nation serve under one command structure, and they are leading the war on terror. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities, I have the distinct honor of working with the members of SOCOM. It is clear that our Nation's Special Operations Forces are the most unified, well equipped and fiercest fighting force in the world. In the post-911 world that we live in, their contribution to our national security is more important than ever.

Madam Speaker, we stand here today in remembrance of the lives that were

lost in Operation Eagle Claw. We are also thankful for the men who have followed in their footsteps. As the warriors of SOCOM continue to lead the fight in the war on terror, I join my colleagues in applauding their efforts and successes and thanking them for their dedication to our country.

The meaning of Operation Eagle Claw will be remembered in different ways by different people, but it will always be remembered.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the chairman's resolution which commemorates the bravery of soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines who took part in Operation Eagle Claw 25 years ago. I want to thank my friend, the chairman from New Jersey, for his extraordinary leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, the resolution also commends our Special Operations Forces who are risking their lives for our country today. On April 24, 1980, 8 patriots lost their lives in an effort to rescue hostages from the U.S. Embassy in Tehran. The classified mission was noble in its purpose, yet difficult and risky.

On November 4, 1979, terrorists stormed the U.S. Embassy in Tehran and took 66 American hostages. President Carter sought the hostages' release through diplomatic means but his efforts were to no avail. Ultimately, he approved a hostage rescue mission known as Operation Eagle Claw.

On April 24, 1980 a task force of Army Special Operations Forces, Army Rangers, Air Force Special Operations Wing personnel, and U.S. Navy, Marine and Air Force pilots launched Operation Eagle Claw. They landed in a remote desert in Iran, 200 miles away from Tehran, and planned to execute the hostage rescue mission the following day. However, Madam Speaker, a series of mishaps forced Operation Eagle Claw to be aborted and led to the deaths of 5 brave airmen and 3 Marines.

On January 20, 1981, after 444 days, the U.S. hostages were freed. Nevertheless, it was clear from the tragic deaths of those brave servicemembers during Operation Eagle Claw that our Special Operations Forces needed and deserved more and better resources to do their job.

Congress created the U.S. Special Operations Command, or SOCOM, so that their needs would be met. Today SOCOM consists of more than 50,000 uniformed personnel, jointly integrated from the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force and the Marine Corps, all striving to support our Nation's national security interests.

Operation Eagle Claw represented the best equipment and personnel available at the time. However, SOCOM has elevated crew-on-crew familiarity, team proficiency, and equipment interconnectivity to a new level of excellence.

Madam Speaker, our Nation owes a debt of gratitude to the members of the Special Operations community, particularly those who have given their lives, such as those 8 service members who died during our Operation Eagle Claw. Our Special Operations Forces are truly, truly the quiet professionals committed to the concept of selfless service.

So as we face the challenges of terrorists and weapons of mass destruction, Special Operations Forces provide a vital tool to defend our great Nation abroad. The resolution brought before us today recognizes this contribution. And I again want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) for offering this resolution. I urge all of my colleagues to support its adoption.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAXTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from western Florida (Mr. MILLER) whose district is the home of the Air Force component of the Special Operations Command, AFSOC.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, "They tried and that was important," said Colonel Thomas Schaefer, the U.S. Embassy defense attache and one of hostages. "It is tragic 8 men died, but it is important America had the courage to attempt the rescue."

It was 90 young men who volunteered to go to the desert, and 9 of them never made it home. The oldest, 35; the youngest, 21. Between them, they left 13 children. Captain Harold Lewis has 2 children, Dr. Jim Lewis, now on the medical staff at the Moffitt Cancer Center in Tampa, and Kimberly Lewis, who joined the Coast Guard. Captain Lynn McIntosh has 3 children, Scott, Stewart and Mark, who is currently enrolled in Lincoln Memorial University, Tennessee. Sergeant John Harvey has 2 children, Lauren and John. Tech Sergeant Joel Mayo has 4 children, Douglas, Joel, Jr., Brett, and Kurt, who also served in the Air Force and was honorably discharged in 1998. Finally, Staff Sergeant Dewey Johnson has 2 children, Wesley and Lee Ann.

One of those who died was Air Force Tech Sergeant Joel C Mayo. He was 34. He was from Bonifay, Florida in my district near Hurlburt Field.

Sergeant Mayo, the flight engineer on EC-130, performed his fire control duties so others might escape, until it was too late for him to save his own life. He died while trying to rescue his pilot, Captain Lewis.

One of his comrades and good friends, retired Master Sergeant Taco Sanchez, had this to say about his friend Sergeant Mayo: "I talked to him that night. It is important people understand. Joel had no idea he was going to give his life that night. But if you told him that he was going to die, he still would've gone."

Not only did he die a true hero. But his death gave life to what we now know today as Special Operations Command and the Air Force Special Operations Command.

The Air Force personnel who died were members of the 8th Special Operations Squadron based at Hurlburt Field. At Desert One the 8th SOS was given its motto: "The Guts to Try." The patch of the 15th SOS has 5 burning fires, representing the 5 Air Force personnel who lost their lives. The men who died have not and never will be forgotten.

To all the families we say this: If your loved ones had not died that fateful day, the enormity of the task of integrating the military at the time might not have been realized. The urgency of the situation might not have been fully understood and the creation of the truly Joint Special Operations Command could have been delayed for a number of years, resulting in who knows how many further U.S. casualties.

□ 1045

Of course, this does not bring them back to us, and nothing can replace the emptiness where they once were. Hopefully, time has done all that it can in that regard, but you should know that every citizen of this country owes a special debt of gratitude to your husbands, brothers, sons, fathers, cousins, and comrades who died on that day.

Can you imagine if we had not had the capabilities of Special Operations Command after September 11? We would have still pursued and destroyed the enemy, but who knows how many more American lives would have been lost if we had only had conventional forces to rely on.

Caillin Mayo is one of Joel's grandchildren. She is old enough now to understand our grandfather's sacrifice. It is to her and all the other grandchildren of those eight men that I say this: do not ever forget the sacrifices of your grandfathers. Know that they are all with God and that they will forever look down upon and continue to protect each of you.

Retired Master Sergeant Sanchez's words about his friend Joel Mayo capture the essence of every man on this mission. They were a brave, courageous group of men attempting the impossible for a noble and a worthy cause. They were Marines and airmen, but they came together for one purpose, and that was to rescue Americans, and as Americans, they died together in the desert. They had the guts to try.

God bless them, their families and these United States.

Mr. SAXTON. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), a great veteran of the United States Marine Corps.

Mr. KLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the heroic efforts of the servicemen who participated, and even more

so, those who perished in the unsuccessful rescue attempt of American hostages in Iran, now over 25 years ago.

Madam Speaker, during my 25 years in the Marine Corps, I had the good fortune to know personally many of the heroes of that fateful day, and counted some among my close friends. These brave men were asked, and cheerfully volunteered, to undertake the challenge of rescuing their fellow Americans in a mission of the utmost secrecy and gravest danger.

Members from all branches of our armed services came together, bringing with them the best of skills and experience, but it was not enough to do the job.

In the end, woefully inadequate equipment, tremendous sand storms, and extraordinary logistical challenges contributed to the death of five U.S. Air Force men and three Marines, serious injuries to five additional servicemen and the loss of eight aircraft. But these circumstances in no way diminished the skill and the bravery of the men who took on this hazardous mission against all odds.

The challenge of Operation Eagle Claw began with the isolated location of Tehran. I remember looking at a map after this unfolded and being astonished at the distances involved. Surrounded by more than 700 miles of desert and mountains, the city was essentially cut off, cut off from ready attack by U.S. air or naval forces. We simply did not have anything in the inventory. In addition, the embassy staff and the embassy itself were located in the heart of the city, congested by more than 4 million people.

Even more taxing was the primitive state of the technology and helicopters and equipment with which these men were asked to complete their mission and the secrecy demanded for the planning, training, and execution of the mission.

Madam Speaker, I knew many of the Marines that became the pilots of the Navy CH-53s that were used. In fact, one of my very close friends in the squadron that I was serving with at the time was pulled off for an assignment. He went out with the others and trained in the desert for weeks. We had no idea of the mission. I did not find out about the mission until the rest of America saw it on the news that April.

It was unbelievable secrecy under which these men worked. The equipment by today's standard is incredible. My son is a pilot in the 101st Airborne, and he has got the latest technology and night vision goggles, lightweight devices that clip to his helmet and flip down, allowing him a full view of the cockpit of the Blackhawk helicopter which he flies.

These men did not have that. They had equipment night vision goggles taken from ground crews. They had no visibility outside the narrow tunnel that they were viewing; and yet they took this equipment that, by today's standards, would not be allowed near

an aircraft, and trained in harsh conditions for a mission that they knew was going to be extremely, extremely difficult.

Madam Speaker, a fitting tribute to the men of Operation Eagle Claw is to learn from their experience and apply these lessons to the challenges facing our men and women in uniform today. Some of those have been discussed by my colleagues here on the floor: the creation of the United States Special Operations Command, the joint effort, new technology that is being developed and employed and tested sometimes in battle today.

We must bear in mind the importance of continuing to provide our troops with the resources they need to succeed in a mission and not launch them out with equipment simply unsuited for the job.

To those who perished in Operation Eagle Claw, I offer my gratitude, my deep appreciation, my great respect. To their families and friends, I offer my prayers and my condolences. It is hard to imagine greater heroes taking on a tougher challenge and making such a sacrifice.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 256, an important measure that recognizes the brave servicemen who perished during Operation Eagle Claw, the unfortunate April 24, 1980 attempt to rescue American hostages in Iran. The resolution also recognizes the sacrifice of those who survived and commends all of the Special Operations Forces currently in service. Operation Eagle Claw is truly a moment in our military's history that must be remembered, and I urge my colleagues to come together out of compassion, cooperation and commitment to recognize the valiant soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines who participated in this difficult mission.

First, we must demonstrate compassion for the servicemen who participated in Operation Eagle Claw and those that made the ultimate sacrifice by giving their lives. These dedicated individuals left their families and friends behind to protect American citizens from those who were being held against their will. Although unsuccessful, their mission will be remembered. We must never forget their bravery, and we must do all we can to honor their lives, their sacrifice and their patriotism.

We must also demonstrate a sense of cooperation to ensure that the efforts of the servicemen of Operation Eagle Claw will not go unrecognized. On that tragic day, members of the U.S. Army Special Operations Forces, Army Rangers, Air Force Special Operations, the U.S. Navy, Marines and Air Force all joined together to conduct their mission. Because of their valiant efforts to conduct the mission while dealing with poor equipment and a lack of funding, the U.S. Congress subsequently formed the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM). Today, USSOCOM continues to prove its immense value to our national defense, and it is important that we come together today and properly honor their courage by cooperating here in Congress to support these fine men and women in every way possible!

And, finally, we must uphold our commitment to ensure that our Special Operations

Forces and our military have all the resources they need to continue to protect our country in the days to come. During my tenure in Congress, I have had the honor to represent or share representation of Fort Bragg, which is home to the U.S. Army Special Operations Command and the Joint Special Operations Command—vital components of USSOCOM. I will continue to work with my colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee to ensure that we do our part to meet the needs of our special operators and the officers who are charged with leading them into the battlefield. In fact, I have spearheaded the Special Operations Forces Caucus, along with four of my colleagues, Representatives ROBIN HAYES (NC), JEFF MILLER (FL) and JIM DAVIS (FL) to ensure that the needs of our special operators are met.

Each and every day, our Special Operations Forces, along with our other servicemen and women in all the branches of our military, put themselves in harm's way to fight for our nation's freedoms here at home and abroad. Now is the time that we come together with compassion, cooperation and commitment to remember those that served during Operation Eagle Claw and ensure that they are properly recognized and honored. They are our heroes, and I am pleased to support H. Res. 256, which takes the necessary step to honor not only those who perished on that tragic day, but also those courageous individuals who make up our Special Operations Forces. May God bless all of them and their families.

Mr. SAXTON. Madam Speaker, we have no more speakers on our side, and we yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 256, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in remembrance of the members of the Armed Forces who perished in the April 24, 1980, rescue attempt of the American hostages being held in Iran and commending all special operations forces personnel currently in service."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPROVING THE RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS CONTAINED IN THE BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 52) approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 52

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress approves the renewal of the import restrictions con-

tained in section 3(a)(1) of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), my friend. In 2003, Congress passed the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act, which among a number of things imposed an import ban on all products from Burma. Today, the House considers extending this import ban for an additional year.

Madam Speaker, the situation in Burma remains deeply troubling. The actions by the military in Burma continue to demonstrate its inability to promote an equitable way of life for millions of Burmese.

Despite the deplorable conditions in Burma today, the United States remains committed to political and social change in Burma. In fact, the United States is one of the few leaders willing to shine the light on the lack of human rights in Burma. Within the international community, the United States has cosponsored resolutions within the United Nations Commission on Human Rights condemning the human rights situation in Burma. It is tremendously important that we continue to pressure the Burmese Government to become a transparent society, free from human rights abuses that have plagued this Asian nation for so many years.

Pressure must remain in place. Extending trade sanctions puts pressure on the Burmese junta to change its ways. For the pressure to be truly effective, the sanctions must be multilateral and include Burma's main trading partners. Therefore, I encourage the administration to continue to pursue a multilateral response to the atrocities in Burma. This is a critical component for ending the military stranglehold on this society.

I urge all my colleagues to support the resolution that is before us today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the sponsor of the resolution, the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations; and I want to congratulate him for his strong leadership and consistent leadership on human rights issues in this body.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend and distinguished colleague from Maryland for the time, who has been a champion of human rights globally throughout his tenure.

I also want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from California

(Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, my friend, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) for their consistent support of human rights work.

Madam Speaker, in this day and age, nothing is in shorter supply than men and women of moral authority and courage. Burmese democracy leader and Nobel Laureate Aung San Suu Kyi is among the giants of our age. She is right there with Nelson Mandela of South Africa and Vaclav Havel of the Czech Republic, both of whom were prepared to sacrifice years of their lives so that their people could live in a free and open and democratic society.

Madam Speaker, this past weekend, this great lady and champion of democracy celebrated her 60th birthday; but instead of being surrounded by family and friends on this happy day, Aung San Suu Kyi remained imprisoned in Burma, cut off from her supporters, both her family and the people of Burma.

Last Friday, I attempted to deliver 6,000 birthday cards from Americans from across this Nation to Aung San Suu Kyi to the Burmese embassy in Washington. The gate was locked. No Burmese diplomat was willing to accept the birthday greetings to Burma's greatest citizen; but Madam Speaker, I have been dealing with dictatorial regimes all my life, and I do not expect a warm reception from any of them.

I do want Aung San Suu Kyi to know that the entire Congress of the United States and the American people wish her a very happy birthday and the moral fortitude and physical stamina to continue her struggle for the Burmese people and, indeed, for democracy globally.

Madam Speaker, I can think of no better birthday present for Aung San Suu Kyi than the legislation we are discussing at this moment. The only hope for promoting far-reaching political change is by making Burma's ruling thugs pay an economic price for running the Burmese nation and their economy into the ground. By renewing import sanctions for an additional year, fewer dollars will flow into the Swiss bank accounts of the Burmese thugs who run that country.

The tough approach maintained by our country towards Burma, including import sanctions, is encouraging other nations to reconsider their more short-sighted and lenient views on the Rangoon regime.

□ 1100

Some members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations for the first time have begun to criticize Burma for its human rights abuses.

Last November, the European Union itself strengthened its Burma policy in response to ongoing human rights violations. In both cases, it was the strong stand of this Congress that has stiffened backbones and increased the prospects that a multilateral sanctions regime against Burma is possible.

Madam Speaker, Congress must act decisively to renew import sanctions against Burma. We must send a strong signal of support for the restoration of democracy and human rights in that impoverished and subdued Nation.

This great woman, Aung San Suu Kyi, before long will occupy her rightful position as the democratically elected leader of the people of Burma, and I look forward to being there in Rangoon as she is sworn in as the leadership of a free and democratic country. I urge all of my colleagues to support the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act in its accession.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) who himself has gained a great reputation in this Congress as being a champion of human freedoms.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) for his leadership on this issue and so many other issues on the Committee on Ways and Means. I also commend the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, for offering this legislation which would renew the Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003 for Burma and the import restrictions that are contained in that important legislation.

As my colleagues know, Burma today remains one of the most repressive military dictatorships in the world, where human rights are routinely and systematically repressed and violated. So it is fitting and necessary that Congress today is moving to renew this important legislation.

The Burmese dictatorship today incarcerates 1,400 political prisoners and continues to harass and repress one of the bravest leaders of our time, Nobel Peace Prize winner Aung San Suu Kyi, who, by the way, turned 60 this past weekend. I, like many other Members in this body, have tried to get into Burma to press for human rights; and my visa, like others, has been turned down, denying Member of Congress the opportunity to even meet with the military junta that continues to repress its citizens.

Madam Speaker, up to 70,000 child soldiers are exploited in Burma, more than any other country in the world. Up to 2 million people have been forced to flee the country as refugees and migrants. Burning of villages continues in eastern Burma, especially in Karen and Karenni states. And Aung San Suu Kyi continues to be persecuted and harassed by this brutal dictatorship.

Sanctions do work, I say to my colleagues. But they often take time. Other countries, I'm happy to say, are beginning to follow the lead of the United States. In a major and important move, the European Union in October 2004 followed the lead of the United States and significantly

strengthened its sanctions in Burma, including a ban on investments in enterprises of the ruling regime and a strengthened visa ban. The EU also pledged to join the United States in opposing loans to Burma's regime from the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Support at the United Nations is growing as well. Burma was one of the few countries on the resolution's list that passed at the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. I was there in Geneva working that resolution as well as resolutions on Cuba, Sudan, and Belarus, and it was as one of the few that made it through.

After the United States Senate and the House passed resolutions in October 2004 calling on the Security Council to address the situation in Burma, the Parliament of Australia followed suit. Their motion called on the government to support the Burmese National League for Democracy's call for the U.N. Security Council to convene a special session to consider what further measures the U.N. can take to encourage democratic reform and respect for human rights in Burma.

Additionally, the European Parliament passed a resolution calling on the U.N. Security Council to address the situation in Burma as a matter of urgency. Additionally, 289 members of our friends in the British Parliament tabled a motion calling on the U.N. Security Council to address the situation in Burma.

There has even been unprecedented action within the ASEAN countries. Whereas in the past they refused to even comment on what they deemed to be Burma's internal affairs, many members of that organization are now publicly pressing Burma to step aside as the chair of the association in 2006. The tough approach maintained by the U.S. toward Burma, including import sanctions and a possible boycott of 2006 meetings, is encouraging many Asian countries to rethink whether the Burmese regime should assume that rotating chairmanship. There is widespread belief within the leadership of the ASEAN countries that Burma has failed, and failed miserably, to deliver on its promises to the region.

All in all, and I point to these above-mentioned instances, the strong stand of the United States, and I commend President Bush and former President Clinton because both have been united in their belief that Burma needs to be sanctioned and isolated in a way that hopefully leads to reform and change. Moreover, our resolution to promote freedom and democracy in Burma has stiffened the backbones of many countries around the world.

Today the EU, the U.N., and ASEAN countries are moving in the right direction to take a strong stand against Burma's dictatorship.

And to Aung San Suu Kyi: Your courage and goodness and persistence are beyond extraordinary. Our prayers are with you.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, as the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) has pointed out, June 19 marked the 60th birthday of Aung San Suu Kyi, who has dedicated her life to bringing about democracy in Burma and was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1991.

Her party, the National League of Democracy, won a landslide victory in the country's 1990 elections; but the results were not recognized by the ruling Burmese military junta. Unfortunately, Ms. Aung San Suu Kyi, who has spent 10 out of the last 16 years in confinement, could not celebrate her birthday with her friends and supporters. Instead, she remains under house arrest.

The plight of Aung San Suu Kyi is a sign of how little things have changed in Burma. According to the U.S. State Department's March 2005 report to Congress on conditions in Burma and U.S. policy toward Burma, "prospects for meaningful political change and reform in Burma have continued to decline."

The Government of Burma continues to harass and arrest people for taking part in peaceful political activities; more than 1,200 people remain in jail for their political beliefs. The State Peace and Development Council, the controlling military junta, has continued to severely abuse its citizens' human rights. Freedom of speech, press, religion, assembly, and association remain greatly restricted. In ethnic minorities areas, the Burmese Government has engaged in persecution, torture, extrajudicial executions, demolition of places of worship, rape, and forced labor.

Security forces regularly monitor the movements and communications of residents, search homes without warrants, and relocate people forcefully without compensation or legal recourse.

In light of Burma's continued dismal record in respecting human rights and suppressing democracy, I urge my colleagues to extend the ban on imports on Burmese products for another year. The utter disregard of the Government of Burma for the rights of its citizens cannot be ignored.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of this resolution. Burma is ruled by a ruthless military regime. I visited the Thai-Burma border a few years ago, and I met with victims of the horrific repression that is occurring there, the IDPs, former political prisoners, democracy activists, women who have been raped, landmine victims, orphans, and widows. The SPDC uses rape as a weapon of terror. They engage in ethnic cleansing, wiping out whole villages and towns, killing women, men, and children. They

seek to eliminate the ethnic minorities in the tribal areas such as Karen and Karenni.

Many believe that we need to reverse our course on sanctions in order to help the Burmese people. They are wrong. The Burmese economy is so rotted under this corrupt regime that trade does not help the people. It is like pouring money into a pocket with a hole in it. The road to change in Burma is not trade, it is political reform.

The SPDC must release Aung San Suu Kyi, the duly elected leader. ASEAN must take a clear stand against the Burmese leadership and deny it from leadership and chairing ASEAN. And the U.S. must do a better job of organizing support at the U.N. Security Council for a comprehensive resolution calling for national transition and reconciliation. Sanctions are absolutely necessary. I urge passage of this resolution.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) on this bill, and also comment about the long history of human rights protection of the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). I rise in strong support of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act and urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this bill.

There has been a brutal campaign of village burnings, destruction of rice supplies, killings by Burmese military, this outlaw regime, and it has resulted in displacement of between 500,000 and 1 million innocent citizens living in eastern Burma. Hundreds of thousands of these internal refugees we call internally displaced persons, IDPs, are persecuted for their commitment to democracy and their belief in human rights. These IDP victims are being systematically hunted down by the evil tyrants of this military regime in Burma. Secretary Rice has rightly called Burma one of the six outposts of tyranny in our world. These tactics used by the junta in Burma add up to ethnic cleansing.

Many Americans are not aware of what is occurring in Burma, but this act is a step in the direction that will show all peoples in the world that Americans care about freedom and democracy, no matter where it is and where it hopes to be in the world.

It is my desire and hope for my colleagues cosponsoring this bill that these sanctions called for in this joint resolution will continue to grab the attention of the Burmese junta and pressure them to release Aung San Suu Kyi and allow their country to enjoy the freedoms and rights of a true democracy so that all people may have the right, as President Jefferson said, to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an article that appeared in the International Herald Tribune this past Sunday, written by Seth Mydans. The article is on Ms. Aung San Suu Kyi who we have heard so much about during this debate, really a true heroine in our time.

[From the International Herald Tribune, June 19, 2005]

TEST OF WILLS: THE BURMESE CAPTIVE WHO WILL NOT BUDGE

(By Seth Mydans)

BANGKOK.—Seventeen years ago, as the people of Myanmar filled the streets in mass protests against their military dictatorship, a striking, self-possessed woman rose to address a rally at the great golden Shwedagon Pagoda. At the time, nobody realized the price she would pay for her outspokenness.

The woman, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, was visiting from her home in England to tend to her sick mother when pro-democracy protests swelled throughout the country in August 1988 despite a brutal response by the military that took thousands of lives.

In the months that followed she emerged, through a combination of charisma and pedigree, to lead what has so far been a futile opposition to the country's military leaders.

On Sunday, Mrs. Aung San Suu Kyi will mark her 60th birthday under house arrest, where she has spent most of the intervening years, in an increasingly dilapidated house, more cut off than ever from contacts outside her weed-filled compound.

Her birthday has become an occasion for new international protests against a military junta that holds the country in its grip, jailing its opponents while ruining the country's economy and waging war against its ethnic minorities.

From one of the region's most refined and richly endowed nations, Myanmar has become its most desperate and reviled.

As the daughter of the country's founding hero, U Aung San, she held a nearly mystical appeal for people desperate to regain their freedoms and self-respect. With her dignity, self-sacrifice and perseverance, she has created a legend of her own.

She was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1991 and has joined the company of Nelson Mandela and the Dalai Lama of Tibet as international icons of a struggle for freedom. But in a contest between brute force and principle, between repression and the clearly expressed will of the people of Myanmar, it is the men with the guns who have managed so far to prevail, and the country's moral symbol who is their prisoner.

Calls for the release of Mrs. Aung San Suu Kyi have come from around the world in recent days, including statements from Washington and from Secretary General Kofi Annan of the United Nations.

In Norway, the chairman of the Nobel Committee, Ole D. Mjoes, issued a rare statement about a past laureate, saying: "We ask that she be set free immediately. We look forward to the day that democracy again rules her country."

But the generals have released her twice already, most recently in May 2002, only to be shaken and shamed at her continuing, overwhelming popularity: huge crowds that gathered wherever she appeared.

One year after her last release, her convoy was attacked by an organized mob in what some analysts believe was an attempt to kill her, and she was returned to house arrest after a period of harsh treatment in prison.

"She has become the only leader that the Burmese people have acknowledged since the

death of her father in 1947," said Josef Silverstein, an expert on Myanmar at Rutgers University. "I would add that she has in every way possible emulated what her father stood for, which was for the right of the people to govern themselves and to have a free and democratic country."

Shortly after her address at the Shwedagon Pagoda, she explicitly assumed her father's mantle, saying she would dedicate her life to the people of her country as he had done.

She made that clear in 1999 when she chose not to visit her husband, Michael Aris, in England, when he was dying of cancer, because she feared that the government would bar her from re-entering Myanmar. The Myanmar authorities had refused to allow him to visit her.

The United States, the European Union and other nations have responded to repression in Myanmar with economic penalties that have done little to affect its leadership. Myanmar's giant neighbors, China and India, with several other Asian nations, offer it an economic lifeline.

But opposition from the West is putting pressure on the junta now as it prepares to take over the rotating leadership of the regional 10-member political and economic grouping, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, next year.

The United States and some other nations have hinted strongly in recent weeks that they will boycott an annual meeting to which they are invited if it is held in Myanmar. Its regional neighbors, facing potential embarrassment, are beginning to press the junta to skip its turn as regional leader if it does not release Mrs. Aung San Suu Kyi and improve its record on human rights.

At the same time, there has been an eruption of internal turmoil among the ruling generals, though like most things in Myanmar its details and its causes are unclear.

In October, Prime Minister Khin Nyunt, who was the head of military intelligence and one of the country's most powerful leaders, was fired and placed under house arrest. His trial on expected corruption charges has either begun or is about to begin, according to conflicting reports.

Over the years, as repression has continued in Myanmar, some of Mrs. Aung San Suu Kyi's allies abroad have complained about what they call her stubbornness and intransigence. But it is the military leaders who have several times switched track, ignoring her and vilifying her, opening and closing dialogues, freeing and rearresting her.

She has also been criticized for demanding that the government recognize the results of a parliamentary election in 1990 that was won overwhelmingly by her party, the National League for Democracy.

The remarkably open parliamentary election was a characteristic misjudgment by the junta, which had apparently expected to win. When Mrs. Aung San Suu Kyi's party won more than 80 percent of the seats, the generals refused to recognize the results and clung to power.

Many who won seats were arrested. Bit by bit over the years the junta has whittled away at their party. Today its leaders are aging—Mrs. Aung San Suu Kyi is the youngest—and its youth wing has atrophied.

More and more, the democratic opposition to military rule in Myanmar is personified by one isolated and determined woman. "Her stubbornness is her strength," Mr. Silverstein said. "This woman will not bend and will not break."

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, In recognition of the Burmese State Peace and Development

Council's (SPDC) failure to comply with the conditions described in H.R. 2330, "Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003," I commend my colleague and the ranking Member of the Committee on International Relations, Rep. TOM LANTOS for his strong stand on restoring democracy in Burma and holding the military Junta accountable.

Seventeen years ago the people of Myanmar rose up in mass protest against the SPDC, which had established power through a military coup. Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, daughter of the country's founding hero, U Aung San, was arrested as a result of her pro-democracy stance during these protests. Following in her father's footsteps, she devotes her life to the people of Burma and freedom. As a leader of the National League for Democracy, NLD, she was seen as a threat to the SPDC power basis and unjustly imprisoned.

In 1990 Parliamentary elections were held, in which an eighty percent majority voted in support the NLD. In 1991, Mrs. Kyi was awarded the Nobel peace prize in recognition for her instrumental role in Burma's struggle for freedom.

Since the SPDC has taken power, it has continued to dismiss and neglect any meaningful dialogue with the United Nations in addressing their continuing persecution of opposition members. The SPDC continually fails to address their past and present human rights violations and fails to cooperate with U.S. efforts to stop the exporting of heroin and methamphetamines; while providing safety and harbor for persons involved with narcotics trafficking.

The SPDC supports the integration of the military into all facets of the economy, thus destroying all notions of a free economy; while using currency generated from the Burmese people to purchase and sponsor an institution of terror and repression.

The SPDC has done everything in its power to repress democracy and the will of the people of Burma.

It is clear further sanctions must be taken in order for this struggle to come to an end. Despite sanctions taken by the U.S. the European Union and many other nations, economic relief is still available for the SPDC. China, India and many other ASEAN countries still trade with Burma providing them with the necessary lifeline to maintain their reign of oppression.

If economic penalties are to be effective, multi-lateral support is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support with President Bush, Secretary General Kofi Annan of the United Nations, Ole D. Mjoes of the Nobel Committee and my fellow Congressional colleagues in calling for an end of state sponsored tyranny in Burma. Justice can only be served when the release of all political prisoners, freedom of speech and the press, freedom of association and the peaceful exercise of religion become constitutional rights.

The fact that Burma will be the rotating chair of the Association of South East Asian Nations, ASEAN is troubling. I believe President Bush and Secretary Rice should engage our allies Singapore, Thailand, India as well as China to focus on using their ties with the government of Burma to promote democracy in Burma and freedom for the Burmese people.

An agreement between the SPDC and NLD must be made so that the transfer of power to

a civilian government, that is accountable to the Burmese people through democratic elections under the rule of law, can be made. For those reasons H.R. 2330 must be renewed. We cannot waiver on our policy until democracy and freedom are restored to the people or Burma.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 52 and of the people of Burma. The people of Burma toil every day under the cruel and heavy yoke of military dictatorship. The military rulers of Burma stifle dissent, persecute minorities, and thwart every attempt at democracy.

The democratically elected and legal leader of Burma, Aung San Suu Kyi, remains imprisoned. Contact between Suu Kyi and the outside is virtually non-existent. Despite growing calls for her release, there is no sign that she will be released from her prison any time soon. Many hundreds of other Burmese men and women remain in appallingly horrible prisons, not because of any truly criminal act, but because of their efforts to bring freedom to Burma.

Burma has more than 600,000 internally displaced people. Furthermore, over 100,000 people are living in refugee camps along the Thai-Burma border. Thousands more are in hiding in China and India. Where Burma was once a country of peaceful coexistence, it has, under this brutal regime, become a place of strife and discord.

The military junta in Burma continues to persecute minority groups. The Burmese military continues to burn villages, destroy crops, and eliminate opponents no matter how peaceful or non-threatening. The destruction of medical supplies and first aid stations continues apace. These acts are not random acts of a few rogue military units far from any authority. These acts are orchestrated at the highest levels by cruel generals sitting in government offices in Rangoon.

Now more than ever, the democratic forces at work in Burma need the continued support of the United States of America. H.J. Res. 52, which I am proud to co-sponsor, will continue the sanctions imposed by the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act.

When the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act was passed, few other countries paid more than scant attention to the tragedy unfolding in Burma. More interested in regional comity or economic gain, many of the same countries we call allies were content to turn a blind eye to Burma's abuses and despicable cruelty.

Since 2003, the veil has been lifted somewhat. Calls for the release of Aung San Suu Kyi and other political prisoners and the establishment of democracy have gone out from previously silent quarters. Once mute ASEAN nations, particularly Singapore, the Philippines, and Malaysia, have gradually increased pressure on Burma to change.

Support for this bill will make it clear to Burmese despots that their military dictatorship, which maintains power through force and terror, is unacceptable. Support for continued sanctions will demonstrate to the world that the United States is serious about bringing change to Burma. It is my hope that our efforts embodied in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act sanctions will encourage more countries, organizations, and individuals to work for freedom, democracy, and a prosperous Burma.

I urge a "yes" vote on H.J. Res. 52.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this bill, I support extending sanctions on Burma for a third year within the framework enacted into law under the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003.

I generally don't believe in unilateral trade sanctions. By preventing trade with Burma, we isolate Burmese citizens from the world and deny them the economic opportunity and better working conditions that trade can create. As a result, sanctions often have the unintended consequence of ultimately harming the people we are seeking to help. In fact, the State Department, for the second time, notes that one effect of the Burma import restrictions has been to cause the closure of more than 100 garment factories and the loss of tens of thousands of Burmese textile jobs. I don't see how those people are better off today than they were a year or two ago.

At the same time, the actions of the ruling junta in Burma continue to be unacceptable. One of the requirements of the law passed in 2003 is for the administration to issue a report on whether the sanctions have been effective in improving conditions in Burma and in furthering U.S. objectives. The State Department, in its second report, observes that Burma's already poor human rights record has worsened over the past year. Moreover, the junta's exclusion of pro-democracy groups from the National Convention assembled to draft a new constitution suggests that Burma is not on the road to true democratic reform. Given the current situation, I believe action by the United States is warranted and sanctions are appropriate if they are limited, targeted, and effective.

At the same time, the State Department also acknowledges that some opposition politicians in Burma question whether U.S. sanctions have any chance of success and whether they are worth the pain caused to Burmese workers. I share this skepticism. No other country has implemented the same set of economic sanctions as the United States. If we are to successfully influence the government of Burma, sanctions must be truly multilateral and international like those used to bring an end to apartheid rule in South Africa. While I support the extension of the sanctions for another year, this effort to build multilateral pressure is key to my continued support for sanctions against Burma.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support of House Joint Resolution 52, supporting the renewal of the import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003. As an original cosponsor of this Resolution, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of this resolution. Today we must send a strong message to the ruthless military dictators in Rangoon that their repressive rule over what Secretary Rice deemed an "outpost of tyranny," is antithetical to the fundamental American values of freedom, liberty, and democracy.

On May 30, 2003, Congress passed the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act in response to the junta's merciless crackdown on democratic reformers. The National League for Democracy's popular elected leader, Aung San Suu Kyi, was placed under house arrest and many of her colleagues were murdered. This important bill banned imports from Burma, mainly affecting the textile and garment industries, until the junta made major

progress to end human rights violations. According to the bill, until the military regime ceases its systemic campaign of repression, aggression, and state-sponsored terror against its own people, meaningful sanctions will persist.

Two years later, the junta's extremely poor human rights record has not improved, instead it worsened. Aung San Suu Kyi recently spent her 60th birthday detained under house-arrest in her dilapidated home. Citizens in Burma still do not have the right to criticize their government. Security forces continue to murder political opponents with impunity. Disappearances persist, and security forces rape, torture, beat, and otherwise abuse prisoners and detainees. Hundreds of thousands of displaced persons in eastern Burma have been uprooted from their homes and forced to live in relocation sites under horrendous humanitarian conditions.

As the United States is developing its future 21st Century relationship with Southeast Asia, the regime in Burma is stuck in an early 20th Century destabilizing military style of governance. International pressure is mounting on Burma for reform. Burma's neighbors, including Malaysia, are calling for the release of Aung San Suu Kyi. If Burma wants to participate in the international community, and be recognized as the rotating chairman of ASEAN, it must undergo sweeping democratic reforms. The United States ought to continue advocating a policy of zero tolerance by renewing its ban on imports from Burma until such reforms are made. Congress must seize this opportunity to demonstrate its resolve to uphold the highest standards of human rights by supporting House Joint Resolution 52.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.J. Res. 52 and the renewal of sanctions on Burma. It is high time that the Burmese junta release Aung San Suu Kyi, the key to political transition in Burma, and allow the restoration of democracy in Burma. I will continue to support stronger efforts by the United States, the United Nations, and others to ensure that the continued abuse of human rights in Burma becomes neither accepted nor forgotten. Sanctions are necessary pressure, but insufficient. In particular, I believe that the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) should deny Burma the rotating chair, as having Burma in a leadership position would be an embarrassment to all ASEAN members.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 52.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.J. Res. 52.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

□ 1115

RECOGNIZING THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 160) recognizing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day, and expressing the sense of Congress that history should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and solving the challenges of the future.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 160

Whereas news of the end of slavery did not reach frontier areas of the United States, and in particular the Southwestern States, for more than 2 years after President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation of January 1, 1863, and months after the conclusion of the Civil War;

Whereas on June 19, 1865, Union soldiers led by Major General Gordon Granger arrived in Galveston, Texas, with news that the Civil War had ended and that the enslaved were free;

Whereas African Americans who had been slaves in the Southwest celebrated June 19, commonly known as Juneteenth Independence Day, as the anniversary of their emancipation;

Whereas African Americans from the Southwest continue the tradition of Juneteenth Independence Day as inspiration and encouragement for future generations;

Whereas for more than 135 years, Juneteenth Independence Day celebrations have been held to honor African American freedom while encouraging self-development and respect for all cultures;

Whereas although Juneteenth Independence Day is beginning to be recognized as a national, and even global, event, the history behind the celebration should not be forgotten; and

Whereas the faith and strength of character demonstrated by former slaves remains an example for all people of the United States, regardless of background, religion, or race; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That—

(1) Congress recognizes the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day to the Nation;

(2) Congress supports the continued celebration of Juneteenth Independence Day to provide an opportunity for the people of the United States to learn more about the past and to better understand the experiences that have shaped the Nation;

(3) the President is urged to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe Juneteenth Independence Day with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs; and

(4) it is the sense of Congress that—

(A) history should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and solving the challenges of the future; and

(B) the celebration of the end of slavery is an important and enriching part of the history and heritage of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Government Reform, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 160 that recognizes the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day.

This resolution, offered by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), is a meaningful reminder of the monumental day that marks the end of slavery in the United States. Originally an African-American celebration, Juneteenth is certainly now a day for all Americans to observe the end of slavery in the United States which was, with little question, the most dreadful period in our Nation's history.

Mr. Speaker, as the Civil War raged in late 1862, President Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, which would become effective on January 1, 1863. The proclamation declared all slaves in the Southern Confederate States free from New Year's Day 1863 forward.

Juneteenth is a celebration of June 19, 1865, on which date news of the Emancipation Proclamation finally reached Texas, which was the last secessionist State to emancipate its slaves, nearly 2 years after the Emancipation Proclamation was issued. The delay was a result of there being nearly no Union presence in south Texas to implement President Lincoln's decree. Not until Union General Gordon Granger arrived in Galveston, Texas, on the gulf coast and read the proclamation from the docks on the original Juneteenth day did the slaves learn they were freed. The news quickly spread throughout Texas, and celebrations and unimaginable jubilation followed.

After the war ended, Congress ratified the 13th amendment to the Constitution in December 1865 which outlawed all nonpunitive slavery and involuntary servitude in any part of the

United States. While it is a wonderful event, Juneteenth Independence Day remains primarily a somber date. It is a day to honor and show consideration for those who lived and suffered through the tortures of more than 2½ centuries of slavery in America. It is a day that our Nation has gradually accepted. During reconstruction, law usually dictated that Juneteenth celebrations must be held in the outskirts of towns. Finally, June 19th became a Texas State holiday in 1979. Today, people of all backgrounds across the Nation observe Juneteenth Independence Day through a variety of activities.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for authoring House Concurrent Resolution 160. This past Sunday marked the 140th anniversary of Juneteenth Independence Day, and I am pleased that this body has chosen to consider this resolution in such a timely fashion. I strongly support the purpose of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to join with the gentlewoman from Florida in consideration of this resolution and appreciate very much her remarks. I also want to commend Chairman TOM DAVIS and Ranking Member HENRY WAXMAN of the Committee on Government Reform and the Speaker for the expeditious way in which they moved this matter to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, June 19, Juneteenth as it is called, is a unique people's holiday. It is the oldest known celebration of the end of slavery in the United States. It marks the day that Union soldiers arrived in Galveston, Texas, in 1865 with news that the war had ended and that all slaves were now free. Unfortunately, it was 2½ years after the Emancipation Proclamation had been issued. We do not know why it took so long for the news to get to Texas, but we do know that the military general order which was posted that day read in part, "The people of Texas are informed that in accordance with the proclamation from the executive of the United States, all slaves are free."

The news spread like wildfire, and spontaneous celebrations sprang up throughout the State and were repeated each June 19 of each following year. We continue to celebrate Juneteenth because of the importance of slavery in American history and because the lingering effects of slavery remain a part of the legacy of our country. The legacy of slavery continues to play a role in our daily lives and politics. The vast racial disparities in employment, income, home ownership, education, voter registration and participation, health status and mortality all continue to exist. The great historian John Hope Franklin wrote, "Much history occurs of which some historians decide to take no notice."

Juneteenth is the people's answer to the obscuring and distortion of much of the history and experience of African Americans in this country. It is an enduring statement that the truth cannot be suppressed forever, and that the struggle for justice and equality will and must continue. Juneteenth is a great time, not only to celebrate but to remember and renew our hope that tomorrow will be different than yesterday.

I thank all of those who were cosponsors onto this resolution and urge that all my colleagues support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida, the gentleman from Illinois, and all who have joined together to bring this proclamation to the floor, House Concurrent Resolution 160.

Let me turn to the third page of the bill. I think it is important, because some people do ask the question why do we seem to continue to try and repeat history or review history, and I think this section of the bill speaks volumes of the purpose of this resolution. It states, History should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and solving the challenges of the future. It also suggests that this celebration of the end of slavery is an important and enriching part of the history and heritage of the United States.

Often in the early morning hours, I find myself jogging down the Mall. I end there at, or at least my halfway point is the Lincoln Memorial, Abraham Lincoln's shrine, if you will, to what I believe is one of the most noble and great acts of any American President who, despite popular opinion at the time, took the battle to those who would ensnare and harbor our brothers and sisters in slavery. An evil part of our history unfolded back in that decade and that century, to free these people from this wretched, wretched behavior of our past.

So today it is about obviously looking backwards in time to try and paint a portrait for young people today to suggest never ever again should this type of behavior be ever allowed in a free soil with free people and that we learn from this tragedy and this horrible dark period in our history the lessons that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and that they are and should be given liberty and justice. I thank all those parties who are involved in this resolution.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL), an original cosponsor of this resolution.

(Mr. BOSWELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a very special day. I congratulate and I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) and my dear friend from Chicago, Illinois (Mr. DAVIS). Perhaps this is one of those times where everything has been said but maybe all of us have not said it yet, but I think it needs repetition. We have been at this for a while. It should have happened some time ago. Efforts were actually made.

Can you imagine the feeling that went on there in the Southwest when the general rode in and said, "I've got a message. Well, it's 2 years old, but you're free." I cannot imagine how they must have felt. It celebrates ideals that all Americans share. The desire for freedom and self-determination are at the very soul of the American dream. I think we all understand that. Throughout the history of the United States, we have grown as a Nation and a people. Learning from our past, as has been said, learning that freedom and liberty are ideals we must to work for and there is yet work to do.

Since the first Juneteenth celebration in Galveston, this remembrance has grown into a regional, national and global celebration of freedom. In my own State of Iowa, the seventh State to recognize this independence day, Juneteenth is met with multiple days of education, history, camaraderie, celebration and community spirit.

Last Saturday in Evelyn Davis Park, one of the favorite places in Des Moines, Iowa, the African-American community and many others, the mayor, myself, others, we came together to celebrate and to share together and to enjoy this really national remembrance. A week prior at the Fort Des Moines Hotel, Dr. Myers, Reverend Myers, if you will, came to key-note speak to us and give us the background and history of the other efforts that have been made. I am very, very proud of the efforts that he made to come all the way from Alabama, a man who has given his life work to try to make life better for those that are wanting to climb the ladder of success.

I am very proud of my African American constituency in my home State of Iowa. Gary Lawson, chairman of the Iowa Juneteenth committee, has stayed focused and stayed on this, and so when we talked about this over time and we came to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), we were really in concert that this needed to be done.

If I may, I would like to share a couple of names here: Minnie Mallard, Reverend Keith Ratliff, Reverend Elder Day, Linda Carter-Lewis, Ako Abdul-Samad who is on our school board, Kim Baxter, Jonathan Narcisse, Mary Ann Spicer who is very active in many activities with the African American community, Odell McGhee, Willie Glanton, France Hawthorne, Cheryl Bolden, State Representative Wayne

Ford, Amelia Morris, Rudy Simms, Floyd Jones, Dr. Mary Chapman, Odell Jenkins, Barbara Oliver-Hall. Of course, I have mentioned Reverend Ronald Myers. I am sure I have left some out and I probably should not have gone there, but I am very proud to have worked with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) on House Concurrent Resolution 160 recognizing Juneteenth.

History must be regarded as a means of understanding the past and solving the future. It is my hope that we will pass this resolution today. Each one of us should speak to our two Senators and press them to have quick action in the Senate and get this over to the President for his signature. This is the right thing to do, long overdue.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 160, recognizing the historical significance of Juneteenth. Juneteenth is the oldest known African American celebration commemorating the ending of slavery in the United States. This holiday actually started because of events back in my home State of Texas. On June 19, 1865, Union General Gordon Granger led Northern soldiers into Galveston, Texas, first to announce the ending of the War Between the States and to order the release of the last remaining slaves.

□ 1130

President Lincoln had actually issued the Emancipation Proclamation 2 years earlier freeing the slaves. He did so on January 1, 1863, in the midst of the War between the States. This was called the peculiar institution of slavery in the South, and it continued until this historic day, June 19, 1865, in Texas.

So on that day, June 19, 1865, Major General Granger dramatically declared when he landed in Galveston, Texas, "The people of Texas are informed that in accordance with the proclamation from the Executive of the United States, all slaves are free. This involves absolute equality of rights and rights of property between former masters and slaves." Thus the phrase "Juneteenth" originated.

It is interesting to note that the Emancipation Proclamation only freed the slaves in the South, not the border States. It took the 13th amendment to the Constitution to free all remaining slaves in the United States.

In any event, Juneteenth has not only become a Texas holiday but a national event. This past Sunday, thousands of Americans across the Nation celebrated Juneteenth through cultural displays and various educational activities. There have been numerous African American freedom fighters throughout countless generations, and

they paid a precious price to deliver equality and freedom. We have made significant strides in assuring that this country fulfills the words of our national anthem: "The land of free and the home of the brave." But we must remain ever vigilant, and these events such as Juneteenth will help us to remember that the Declaration of Independence must be a true reality for all peoples.

As that Declaration of Independence says, written by Thomas Jefferson: "We" do "hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights; that among these are Life, Liberty, and the" absolute "pursuit of Happiness."

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will simply close. Abraham Lincoln once made the statement that our Nation could not survive half slave and half free. Perhaps, as we look at ourselves today, we might say that our Nation will never become all that it has the possibility of being as long as we continue to experience the great disparities, disparities in health care, disparities in job opportunities, disparities in educational opportunities, disparities in housing, disparities in hope that one can experience the fulfillment of their dreams.

So as we support this resolution, we reflect upon the need for equal justice and continuing the pursuit for equal opportunity to every man his chance, his golden opportunity, to become all that he or she would have the potential of being, all that their hard work, integrity, the essence of their strength, all that their history and culture will combine to make them. That is, indeed, as Thomas Wolf would say, the promise of America. So Juneteenth is a day of hope and a day of promise that America will indeed become the land of the free, home of the brave.

I thank all of those who have come to the floor to speak on this concurrent resolution, all of the co-sponsors who co-sponsored and brought it to us today. I urge all of my colleagues to agree to it so that America does become the America that has never been, but the America that we all know can be.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my support for House Concurrent Resolution 160, a resolution that honors the national significance of June 19, 1865 when slaves in Texas were finally freed. I would like to thank Congressman DAVIS for his leadership and all of the supporters of this important piece of legislation.

On June 19, 1865, General Gordon Granger rode into Galveston, Texas and announced the freedom of the last American slaves; belatedly freeing 250,000 slaves in Texas nearly two and a half years after Abraham Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation. The day coined "Juneteenth" was first celebrated in the Texas state capital in 1867 under the direction of the Freedmen's Bureau. Today, Juneteenth remains the oldest known celebra-

tion of slavery's demise. It commemorates freedom while acknowledging the sacrifices and contributions made by courageous African Americans towards making our great Nation the more conscious and accepting country that it has become.

Not until 1979 when my friend State Representative Al Edwards introduced the bill did Juneteenth become a Texas state holiday. It was first celebrated as such in 1980. Now 25 years later the United States House of Representatives will pass House Concurrent Resolution 160 as our Nation celebrates Juneteenth. As the Representative of the 9th Congressional District of Texas, I am pleased to join my colleagues in acknowledging the historical significance of Juneteenth as we remain ever-vigilant in recognizing that "history should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and solving the challenges of the future."

Civil rights pioneer Martin Luther King Jr. once said, "Freedom is never free," and African American leader A. Phillip Randolph often said "Freedom is never given. It is won." We should all recognize the power and the ironic truth of those statements and we should pause to remember the enormous price paid by all Americans in our country's quest to realize its promise. Juneteenth honors the end of the 400 years of suffering African Americans endured under slavery and celebrates the legacy of perseverance that has become the hallmark of the African American community and its struggle for equality.

As we celebrate the 140th anniversary of Juneteenth, I ask that all of my colleagues join me in reflecting upon its significance. Because it was only after that day in 1865 when General Granger rode into Galveston, Texas, on the heels of the most devastating conflict in our country's history, in the aftermath of a civil war that pitted brother against brother, neighbor against neighbor and threatened to tear the fabric of our union apart forever that America truly became the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 160, a resolution recognizing the importance of the Juneteenth anniversary celebrations held nationwide on June 19. On that date 140 years ago, Union forces arrived at Galveston, Texas, bringing news of the Confederate surrender and enforcing, finally, President Abraham Lincoln's two-and-a-half-year old emancipation of the slaves. The ensuing celebration quickly became an annual event, spreading west to Seattle, north to Minneapolis, and east to Portland, Maine. In my own state of New Jersey, Juneteenth is celebrated at churches, community centers, and family picnics across the state.

I strongly support H. Con. Res. 160, which recognizes the significance of the Juneteenth anniversary and proclaims the sense of Congress that history should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and solving the challenges of the future. I rise to honor the celebration, and to honor the myriad contributions that African-Americans have made to American society in the years before and since. As inventors, teachers, firemen, soldiers, doctors, and statesmen, African-Americans have honored this country with their service and dedication. The longevity of the Juneteenth celebration is an enduring testament to the virtue of celebrating diversity.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I must also rise today to recognize the struggle that still faces us. Juneteenth evokes in all of us thoughts of a dark chapter in our Nation's history, and reinforces that which we already know: the struggle for equality is far from over. The joyous celebration of the emancipation of the slaves of Galveston, Texas, serves to remind us all of the need to remain committed to the justice, and freedom.

Today, Juneteenth is the longest-running celebration of the end of slavery in the United States. Its durability alone illustrates its significance. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, and for all the reasons above, I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting H. Con. Res. 160.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 160, which recognizes the historic significance of Juneteenth Independence Day and encourages its continued celebration so all Americans can learn more about our country's past.

The resolution also rightly expresses the sense of Congress that knowing our history helps us solve challenges we face in the future, and that the celebration of the end of slavery is an important part of the history and heritage of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Juneteenth has long been recognized as the day to celebrate the end of slavery in the United States. Juneteenth is the traditional celebration of the day on which the last slaves in America learned they had been freed.

Although slavery was abolished officially in 1863, it took over 2 years for news of freedom to spread to slaves. On June 19th, 1865, U.S. General Gordon Granger rode into Galveston, Texas and announced that the State's 200,000 slaves were free. Vowing never to forget the date, the former slaves coined the nickname Juneteenth, a blend of the words June and 19th. This holiday originated in the Southwest, but today it is celebrated throughout the Nation.

H. Con. Res. 160 underscores that the observance of Juneteenth Independence Day is an opportunity for all Americans to learn more about our common past and to better understand the experiences that have shaped our great Nation. I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H. Con. Res. 160, legislation commemorating a monumental day in the history of liberty, Juneteenth Independence Day. Juneteenth marks the events of June 19, 1865, when slaves in Galveston, Texas learned that they were at last free men and women. The slaves of Galveston were the last group of slaves to learn of the end of slavery. Thus, Juneteenth represents the end of slavery in America.

I hope all Americans will take the time to commemorate Juneteenth. Friends of human liberty should celebrate the end of slavery in any country. The end of American slavery is particularly worthy of recognition since there are few more blatant violations of America's founding principles, as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, than slavery. I am particularly pleased to join the recognition of Juneteenth because I have the privilege of representing Galveston.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for introducing this resolution, which I am proud to co-sponsor. I thank the House leadership for bringing this resolution to the floor, and I urge all of my colleagues to honor the end of slavery by voting for H. Con. Res. 160.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 160, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 160.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SUPPORTING FIREFIGHTER LIFE SAFETY SUMMIT INITIATIVES AND MISSION OF NATIONAL FALLEN FIREFIGHTERS FOUNDATION AND UNITED STATES FIRE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 180) to support initiatives developed by the Firefighter Life Safety Summit and the mission of the National Fallen Firefighters Foundation and the United States Fire Administration to reduce firefighter fatalities and injuries, to encourage implementation of the new "Everyone Goes Home" campaign to make firefighter safety a national priority, and to support the goals of the national "stand down" called by fire organizations.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 180

Whereas for over 350 years our Nation's firefighters have dedicated their lives to ensuring the safety of their fellow citizens and communities;

Whereas throughout our Nation's history too many firefighters have died in the line of duty, leaving behind family members and friends to grieve their tragic losses;

Whereas these volunteer and career firefighters served with pride and died with honor;

Whereas in 1992 Congress created the National Fallen Firefighters Foundation to lead a nationwide effort to remember the Nation's fallen firefighters and assist their survivors through a variety of programs;

Whereas the National Fallen Firefighters Foundation is dedicated to preventing future firefighter deaths and injuries;

Whereas the National Fallen Firefighters Foundation convened the first ever Firefighter Life Safety Summit in March 2004 to support the United States Fire Administration's goal of reducing firefighter fatalities by 25 percent within 5 years and 50 percent within 10 years through a commitment of energy and resources;

Whereas the Life Safety Summit developed 16 initiatives to significantly reduce firefighter fatalities and injuries, including the need to—

(1) define and advocate the need for a cultural change within the fire service relating to safety, incorporating leadership, management, supervision, accountability, and personal responsibility;

(2) enhance the personal and organizational accountability for health and safety throughout the fire service;

(3) focus greater attention on the integration of risk management with incident management at all levels, including strategic, tactical, and planning responsibilities;

(4) empower all firefighters to stop unsafe practices;

(5) develop and implement national standards for training, qualifications, and certification (including regular recertification) that are equally applicable to all firefighters, based on the duties they are expected to perform;

(6) develop and implement national medical and physical fitness standards that are equally applicable to all firefighters, based on the duties they are expected to perform;

(7) create a national research agenda and data collection system that relates to the initiatives;

(8) utilize available technology wherever it can produce higher levels of health and safety;

(9) thoroughly investigate all firefighter fatalities, injuries, and near misses;

(10) ensure that grant programs support the implementation of safe practices and mandate safe practices as an eligibility requirement;

(11) develop and champion national standards for emergency response policies and procedures;

(12) develop and champion national protocols for response to violent incidents;

(13) provide firefighters and their families access to counseling and psychological support;

(14) provide public education more resources and champion it as a critical fire and life safety program;

(15) strengthen advocacy for the enforcement of codes and the installation of home fire sprinklers; and

(16) make safety be a primary consideration in the design of apparatus and equipment; and

Whereas the International Association of Fire Chiefs, the International Association of Fire Fighters, the National Volunteer Fire Council, and the Congressional Fire Services Institute have partnered with a number of other fire service organizations to call on all fire departments across the Nation to conduct a "stand down" for firefighter safety beginning Tuesday, June 21, 2005, during which fire departments are urged to suspend all nonemergency activity and instead focus entirely on firefighter safety in order to raise the level of awareness toward firefighter safety and call attention to the unacceptable number of line-of-duty deaths and injuries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) supports initiatives developed by the Firefighter Life Safety Summit and the mission of the National Fallen Firefighters Foundation and the United States Fire Administration to reduce firefighter fatalities and injuries;

(2) encourages implementation of the new "Everyone Goes Home" campaign to make firefighter safety a national priority; and

(3) supports the goals of the national "stand down" called by fire organizations beginning on June 21, 2005, and encourages all career, volunteer and combination fire departments across the country to participate in this important and life saving effort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 180.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in the early 1970s, a report by the President's National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control, entitled "America Burning," presented a dismal assessment of fire safety in the United States. The report found that the U.S. had one of the worst, one of the worst, fire safety records in the industrialized world with nearly 12,000 citizens and 250 firefighters lost to fires annually.

In the years that followed that seminal report, the U.S. Fire Administration was created. Fire prevention and fire safety awareness programs were made a priority in communities across the country. And by 1980, deaths suffered from both citizens and firefighters had been significantly reduced. These improvements steadily continued into the 1980s, and by the end of the 1990s, firefighter deaths had been reduced to an average of about 100 annually. A dramatic drop; still too many.

Unfortunately, after 3 decades of great progress, firefighter deaths are disturbingly once again on the rise. In 2003, 112 firefighters lost their lives in the line of duty. Last year 117 died. And so far this year, there have been 58 deaths, on pace for about 130, which is about a 30 percent increase over the average of the previous decade. That, Mr. Speaker, is totally unacceptable.

These troubling statistics have triggered an unprecedented effort by the leadership of America's fire service to address this problem, and the concurrent resolution before us today recognizes and supports those efforts.

Specifically, the concurrent resolution supports three important efforts, which I will briefly describe. First, the resolution supports the 16 fire safety initiatives developed at a recent Firefighter Life Safety Summit convened by the National Fallen Firefighters Foundation. The initiatives were developed to support the U.S. Fire Administration's goal, developed under the strong leadership of Administrator David Paulison, of reducing firefighter fatalities by 25 percent within 5 years and 50 percent within 10 years. We are talking about life.

The initiatives range from broad ideas on the need for cultural change within the fire service related to safety to specific goals such as the development of national standards for training, certification, and physical fitness.

The second effort recognized by this concurrent resolution is the "Everyone Goes Home" campaign to make firefighter safety a national priority. The campaign, led by the National Fallen Firefighters Foundation, intends to

raise fire safety awareness and bring fire prevention to the forefront, using the 16 fire safety initiatives as a blueprint for change.

And the third effort recognized by this concurrent resolution is a national "stand down" for firefighter safety. Today, all across the country, fire departments are being urged to suspend all nonemergency activity and instead focus entirely on firefighter safety, calling attention to the unacceptable number of line-of-duty deaths and injuries. During the stand down, fire departments will talk about the causes of line-of-duty deaths, check apparatus and equipment, discuss health and safety regulations, review fire ground safety issues, and take stock of training needs and fitness goals. The International Association of Fire Chiefs has also requested that all volunteer departments conduct a special safety meeting the evening of June 21, today, or as near to this date as is possible.

I am pleased that we have the opportunity to bring attention to the firefighter safety problem that the fire service is facing today and recognize the importance of these efforts. But this problem, of course, cannot be addressed with one day of recognition. It will take years of steadfast commitment and cooperation by those in the fire service as well as the general public to achieve the fire safety goals set forth by the U.S. Fire Administration. But I am confident that if we work together, we will be successful; and I am hopeful that today's stand down marks an important turning point in our struggle to reduce line-of-duty deaths by firefighters.

And let me just add parenthetically that I am proud to be a Member of this great institution, the Congress of the United States, which has been responsible for initiating the Fire Safety Grant Award program, the SAFER program, providing resources. They get enough words from us on Capitol Hill about how supportive we are of the fire services. They want deeds, and we on a bipartisan basis have followed through by providing literally hundreds of million of dollars to firefighters across the country to get the necessary lifesaving equipment they need to do the job we expect of them: protecting us in our homes and our neighborhoods, our communities.

So we all should take a brief moment to pat ourselves on the back for what we have done responsibly to respond to the problem. But that is not enough, and the fight continues, and I am proud to be a warrior in that fight. None of us had to be drafted. We enlisted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 180, which supports initiatives by the National Fire Service to reduce firefighter fatalities and injuries.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for intro-

ducing this important measure. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is co-chair of the Fire Caucus and is a leading supporter of fire services in Congress and would be here now speaking except that he is in a markup on another legislation.

This concurrent resolution calls attention to the need to take action to reduce firefighter deaths and injury. It explicitly endorses a call from the major fire service organizations for a stand down to promote fire safety. The stand down would apply to every volunteer and career fire department in the Nation.

□ 1145

It would require that each department suspend all nonemergency activities in order to concentrate on measures to raise awareness of safety issues and to institute steps to improve safety.

A growing perception of the need to take corrective action to improve safety was the motivation for a major summit meeting of the fire service community in March 2004. The summit developed 16 firefighter life safety initiatives which are listed in the House resolution.

Unfortunately, despite widespread dissemination and discussion of the initiatives, corrective action has been slow to develop, and the trend in loss in life in the fire service has not improved. The stand down constitutes an action to try to change the culture, which is widely believed to be a key factor in bringing about constructive change.

The fire services perform a critical public safety role, and all Americans respect the high level of devotion to duty and sacrifice that characterize the service personnel. I applaud this resolution that seeks to reduce the loss of life and serious injury that too often occur to firefighters during the performance of their hazardous duties.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this resolution to my colleagues and ask for their support in its passage by the House. Our firefighters have done an incredible job of fire prevention and rescue, saving millions of lives. It is our turn to make sure that we help them by reducing loss of life and serious injury through this resolution.

If I may, I would just like to take a moment to read the names of those that have died in Oregon since 1997. There are 23 names: Randall E. Carpenter, Coos Bay Fire and Rescue; Jeffrey E. Common, Coos Bay Fire and Rescue; Chuck Hanners, Coos Bay Fire and Rescue; Paul E. Gibson, First Strike Environmental, Roseburg, Oregon; David Kelly Hammer, First Strike Environmental, Roseburg, Oregon; Jeffrey D. Hingel, First Strike Environmental, Roseburg; Jesse James, First Strike Environmental, Roseburg; Richard Burt "Richie" Moore, First Strike Environmental, Roseburg; Leland Price, First Strike Environmental, Roseburg, Oregon Department of Forestry Contractor; Mark

Robert Ransdell, First Strike Environmental, Roseburg, Oregon; Ricardo M. Ruiz, First Strike Environmental, Roseburg, Oregon; Robert Chisholm, Gearhart Volunteer Fire Department; Daniel Eric Rama, Grayback Forestry, Inc.; Bartholomew Blake Bailey, Grayback Forestry; Retha Mae Shirley, Grayback Forestry, Inc.; Larry A. Brown, Kingsley Field Fire Department, Klamath Falls; John Robert Hazlett, Odell Fire District; D. Craig Mackey, Oregon Department of Forestry; Lawrence J. "Larry" Hoffman, Oregon Department of Forestry; Thomas Howard Kistler, Polk County Fire District 1; Randall Harmon, Superior Helicopter, Grants Pass; George P. Converse, USDA Forest Service; Alan W. Wyatt, USDA Forest Service; and Richard W. Black, Weyerhaeuser, Eugene Helicopter Operation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In wrapping up, I just want to recall a story about when I was a freshman Member of this great body 23 years ago. I sat on the Committee on Science, and we have jurisdiction over firefighter programs. I recall one of the witnesses being asked if there was a distinction between the professional and volunteer firefighters, and one of my senior colleagues at the time quickly demanded recognition from the chair, and he said to that Member asking the question, There are no amateurs in this business; they are all professionals. Some are paid, some are volunteer, but they are all professionals.

The recognition of that has prompted all of us to initiate the fire safety Grant program, to initiate the SAFER program. We expect so much of our firefighters. They need the resources to do the job that we demand that they do every single day.

All of us in our consciousness have a new appreciation for what the firefighters of America do as a result of 9/11 when 343 firefighters lost their lives. They gave their all for this Nation. Since then, we have developed in some quarters, where there was no prior recognition of the need of the fire service, a new appreciation for what we have to do.

Once again, let me credit this institution. We are often criticized for not being as responsive as some would like to some of the issues facing us across this country. But this institution, on a bipartisan basis, has responded to the call.

Today's resolution is about words and concepts and ideas, but more meaningful is the action, the deeds that we do by appropriating money, by following through to make certain that money is used for its intended purpose and used wisely, and it is. So this, in a sense, is an affirmation of our great appreciation for the firefighters, the men and women all across America on a very professional basis who daily are providing some measure of security for

us in our homes and in our communities, and in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I read a list of 23 names from just those in Oregon, but that list could go on and on and on, depending on the State. I am hoping that through this resolution, although I am not foolish enough to believe that there will be no names, but I would sure like to see that reduced to as few as possible. They have done an incredible service to our country, to our communities, and I wish that for every profession we could look at a little bit later on and say, you have done this amazing job of prevention. Mr. Speaker, they are the ones that really make sure that every home, every business had a fire detector, and we think of the number of lives they have saved just by making sure we had that prevention piece. They have done it over and over and over again.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) is right, they were volunteers, but they were professional. They were there training, they were there every night of the week training, they worked all day. Yet when a fire called, they came from wherever they were to make sure that they helped put out that fire and saved and rescued lives. I represent a district that has many rural communities and, again, we have many volunteer fire departments, but they are professional. I hope my colleagues would support this measure.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased the House is considering this important resolution, which I have introduced with fire caucus co-chairmen CURT WELDON, SHERRY BOEHLERT and ROB ANDREWS.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude not only for their hard work and support on this measure, but for their years of dedication and leadership on issues of importance to the men and women serving our communities, and our Country, in the fire service.

I would also like to also recognize the contributions of Hal Bruno and Ron Siarnicki at the National Fallen Firefighters Foundation, as well as the United States Fire Administrator David Paulison, for having convened the Firefighter Life Safety Summit that resulted in the recommendations upon which this resolution is based.

Finally, Bill Webb at the Congressional Fire Services Caucus, as he does on so many issues, worked to coordinate the efforts of NFFF, USFA, the fire service organizations and our Congressional offices to make this resolution a reality.

Mr. Speaker, for a number of years, the Congressional Fire Services Caucus has worked with the Nation's fire service organizations to identify and address some of the major challenges facing career and volunteer fire departments across the Country.

Among the results of these efforts has been the establishment and funding of such critical federal programs as the Fire Grants and SAFER.

These programs have resulted in billions of dollars being appropriated to help meet the

equipment, training and staffing needs of fire departments in large cities, small towns and rural communities across the Country.

And there is no doubt the dollars provided by these programs have helped save the lives of firefighters and the citizens they protect.

But there is also no escaping the reality that despite the amount of money spent, and the impact of these programs on improving the effectiveness and efficiency of fire departments, we still lose more than 100 firefighters every year to line of duty deaths, so many of which are preventable.

The NFFF and USFA recognized this, and convened the firefighter life safety summit last year, with a goal of reducing firefighter fatalities by 25 percent within 5 years and 50 percent within 10 years.

These are ambitious goals that will only be attained if every member of the Nation's fire service, from the presidents of national organizations to individual firefighters, is committed to implementing the 16 initiatives recommended at the summit, and supported by this resolution.

These recommendations range from developing medical and physical fitness standards for all firefighters to empowering all firefighters to stop unsafe practices.

To highlight the need to adopt these common sense changes, the International Association of Fire Chiefs is leading a national stand down this week, whereby all fire departments are urged to suspend all non-emergency activity and focus on firefighter safety.

This resolution supports this effort, and encourages every fire department to participate in this national stand down in order to raise awareness among our firefighters about the need to take responsibility for their health and safety.

Mr. Speaker, the job of fighting fires is one of the most dangerous and physically demanding activities one can undertake.

The real tragedy is that we have allowed unsafe practices and unhealthy habits to make the job even more hazardous than it already is.

Congress has, and will, continue to accept our responsibility to provide funding for the equipment, training and staffing needs of our departments, but we must insist that our firefighters accept responsibility for making themselves safer on the job.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 180 speaks to the heart of how we as a nation value the lives of each and every one of our firefighters. This resolution is a wake-up call to make firefighter safety a national priority. It is a wake-up call to remind us that we need to do more to prevent and reduce firefighter fatalities and injuries. It begins today, where fire departments across the country are participating in "stand down." Today, at participating departments, all non-emergency activities are suspended and firefighters instead will focus only on firefighter safety. Firefighters are so used to putting their lives at risk to save others that their health and well-being is often neglected. Today we hope to begin a new trend where firefighter safety becomes a top priority for every firefighter, whether volunteer or paid, rural or urban, young or old.

The safety and health of firefighters has never been a more important issue. Firefighters now have more responsibilities with

the increased focus on homeland security and hazard response. We rely on them to protect us from harm while we are at home, at work, and everywhere in between. Regrettably, more than 58 firefighters have died this year, a number that far exceeds the annual pace. This is especially disturbing because most, if not all, of these deaths are preventable. There are measures to be taken to reduce the number of fatalities—measures that are described in this resolution. These firefighters don't have to die. The number of deaths can be reduced, but we have to do more. Not only can we ill-afford to lose over 100 firefighters a year, but we cannot afford to lose any. I fully support the goals of the National Fallen Firefighters Foundation and the United States Fire Administration with respect to firefighter safety. I truly believe that at the end of the day, every firefighter must go home.

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 180.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 10, CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AUTHORIZING CONGRESS TO PROHIBIT PHYSICAL DESECRATION OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 330 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 330

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 10) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate on the joint resolution equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; (2) the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Watt of

North Carolina or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.J. Res. 10 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the joint resolution to a time designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 330 is a structured rule, and it provides 2 hours of debate in the House, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. It waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution. It makes in order the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Committee on Rules report accompanying the resolution, if offered, by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) or his designee, which shall be separately debatable for 1 hour, equally divided between the proponent and an opponent.

The rule waives all points of order against the amendment printed in the report, provides that notwithstanding the ordering of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the joint resolution to a time designated by the Speaker, and it allows one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, in 1989, the United States Supreme Court *Texas v. Johnson* decision nullified the laws of 48 States banning flag desecration. Today, all 50 States have passed resolutions requesting Congress to approve a Constitution amendment for ratification that would ban flag burning.

The House of Representatives has passed the same, if not similar, legislation for five consecutive Congresses. In the 104th Congress, the House of Representatives passed a proposed amendment with the necessary two-thirds majority by a vote of 312 to 120; while the 105th House passed it 310 to 114, the 106th House passed it 305 to 124, the 107th House passed it 298 to 125, and in the last Congress, the 108th, the House passed it by a vote of 300 to 125.

Our flag, with 50 stars and 13 stripes, represents the history, culture, and ideology of democracy for the world. Millions of Americans throughout our Nation's history died defending our flag and the ideals it represents. To burn a flag is to disrespect America and disrespect democracy. For our enemies, those who embrace terrorism,

communism, and totalitarianism, burning the American flag is a sign of defiance, because freedom threatens the existence of tyranny. For our soldiers fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq, our flag is motivation to keep fighting, to move ahead, and reason to liberate a people from fear of oppression, as it has been in every conflict in which our Nation has fought.

□ 1200

For our veterans, the desecration of the flag is a slight for everything they fought for. And it serves to dishonor their friends and fellow soldiers who gave their lives for our country. To the parts of Europe occupied by the allied powers during World War II, the sight of our flag brought tears of joy because it symbolizes an end to atrocity and oppression and the return of freedom.

A constitutional amendment to ban flag desecration is not the end of our first amendment liberties. The Constitution was drafted as a living document that is capable of changing when called for by the overwhelming desire of the American people.

The debate to end flag desecration is an important issue that carries the overwhelming public support needed to pass an amendment to our Constitution. The Constitution is the foundation of our government, and modifying it should not be taken lightly. However, the American citizens have consistently spoken in favor of this amendment for more than 10 years, and it is an issue that is more than 3 decades old.

Our laws provide an opportunity for every citizen to express their opinions freely. If someone does not like the policies of our Nation, the party in power, our military, or even a specific law, they have the ability to protest, to voice concerns, write letters to their Congressmen without the consequences of death or imprisonment.

This freedom is not found in all nations. The desecration of the American flag, however, is not a form of free speech. It is a challenge to the institution that defends liberty. Although some may disagree, the United States is not the root of the world's problems; rather, we have provided relief from subjugation and freedom to many nations.

For those liberated by America and those who cherish freedom, our flag represents more than a Nation, government, or people. It is an emblem of liberty and justice. Our flag deserves to be respected and protected because it is more than just star-studded fabric; it is the symbol of democracy.

With that in mind, I request unanimous support of this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), for yielding me time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to ask my colleague from Georgia a question, if he does not mind, and engage in just a brief colloquy.

Does the gentleman know or has his staff related to him, when the last time occurred in America that a flag was burned, and how often that occurs, let us say, in the last year or 2?

Mr. GINGREY. Well, if the gentleman will yield, since the Supreme Court decision, in response to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), since 1994 it is my understanding that there have been at least 119 reports of incidents involving flag desecration.

The Supreme Court ruling, that 5 to 4 decision that allowed flag desecration, flag burning as part of free speech, that was 1989. Since 1994, to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my understanding is 119 incidents.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. And reclaiming my time, does the gentleman distinguish between flag burning and other forms of desecration when he cites the 119? I have no memory of a flag burning in recent times. And I am curious to know whether or not you do.

Flag burning is what this Congress constitutional amendment is about.

Mr. GINGREY. In response to the gentleman, no, I do not know.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. That is my point, reclaiming my time, among others. This is not something that happens frequently.

We begin this debate today as patriotic Americans, you and I, Dr. GINGREY, and the other 433 Members, voting Members of the House of Representatives, and the five delegates to this House.

We began this day with one of our celebrated ideals. It was in 1777 that the Founding Fathers of this Nation determined that there should be a flag as a symbol. Symbol, that is what it is. All of us abhor desecration of the flag. Desecrating the flag is disrespectful and downright disgusting.

But I am curious, because I asked two people in my district, knowing that I would be handling this rule, to observe on their way to work on June 14 the number of people that flew their flags. It is astounding, all of this talk about the flag, and how few people on June 14, that is just recently, on Flag Day, flew their flags.

I am curious, I wonder how many Members did that as well. We begin this debate today with an unresolved war in Afghanistan and Iraq. We begin this debate today with Americans dying in Iraq and Afghanistan and families crying as a result thereof.

We begin this day with the President of the United States saying that we have a Social Security crisis, and one would argue not against the notion that Social Security needs to be reformed in an appropriate manner by the body.

We began this day with a serious Medicaid crisis in this country which

we are not addressing. We began this day with an equally serious Medicare crisis which we are not addressing.

We began this day with AIDS raging throughout this country, and sexually transmitted diseases are ripe in our society; and we are not doing as much as we can about it. But yet we come to debate embedding the flag in our precious Constitution in as far as its desecration is concerned.

We begin this debate with millions of Americans without jobs. Some unemployed, some underemployed, and some never to be employed again as a result of the laws of industry in this country from a manufacturing point of view.

This debate begins with oil magnates and their companies receiving their highest profit ever in the history of this country, and American drivers paying the highest prices ever for gasoline; and yet we do not have an energy policy, and other than a handful of us, including myself, no one is introducing legislation to address the high cost of gasoline.

We began this debate today with more than 40 million Americans without health care, 2 million Americans in jail, millions of children dropping out of school. And the best we can do is stir up emotions and divisions by holding a debate about our precious flag. Nothing in the way of positive understandings is coming about as far as immigration problems in this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the underlying resolution. I firmly believe that passing this bill would abandon the very values and principles upon which this country was founded.

Make no mistake, all of us, as I have said, abhor the desecration of the flag. The flag is a symbol of our country and a reminder of our great heritage. When I graduated from high school in 1954, my assigned topic at that graduation had to do with the song, "The Old Flag Never Touched the Ground."

When Frances Scott Key wrote the Star Spangled Banner, the flag was tattered and torn; when it was raised in Montezuma or at Arlington Cemetery, all of us are proud every day that that flag flies over this Capitol and elsewhere.

I find it unfortunate that a few individuals choose to desecrate that which we hold so dear. However, it is because of my love for the flag and the country for which it stands that unfortunately I have no choice but to oppose this well-intentioned, yet misguided, legislation.

Our country was founded on certain principles. Our Founders had the broadest visionary scope of their times. Chief among these principles are freedom of speech and expression. These freedoms were included in the Bill of Rights because the Founding Fathers took deliberate steps to avoid creating a country in which individuals' civil liberties could be abridged by the government.

Yet, that is exactly what this amendment would do. In my opinion, it be-

gins a dangerous trend in which the government can decide which ideas are legal and which must be suppressed.

I believe that the true test of a nation's commitment to freedom of expression is shown through its willingness to protect ideas which are unpopular, such as flag desecration. When I was a lawyer, I represented a member of the Ku Klux Klan, because they would not let him put his ad on a Negro station at that time that was owned by members of the Jewish faith.

I won that lawsuit, and I stood for his rights, because I knew if they took his rights away, it would be just a matter of time before they could be able to take mine away. As the Supreme Court Justice, the eminent Oliver Wendell Holmes, wrote in 1929, it is an imperative principle of our Constitution, that it protects not just freedom for thought and expression we agree with, but freedom for the thoughts we hate.

To the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), you and I and all of our colleagues hate it when someone burns a flag. I remember the very last time that I saw one burned sitting in my living room with my mom.

And almost without hesitation, both of us referred to those people as fools, and we used choice words in front of the word fools. Throughout this debate, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that some of our colleagues are going to try to paint some of us Democrats as unpatriotic. They will tell the American people that because we support the protection of our civil liberties and the constitutional right for an American to burn her flag, we are therefore not loyal citizens. They will demagogue us, and some may even accuse the judiciary, a separate and equal branch of government established under article 3 of the Constitution, of being a body filled with activist judges because the highest court in our land has already said that the act of burning an American flag is permissible under the first amendment of the Constitution.

To those who intend to levy such artificial claims, I say shame on you. You see, Mr. Speaker, this Congress and the Bush administration loves draping itself in the flag when talking about troops and terrorism. And there is absolutely nothing wrong with that, if they so choose to do that.

Yet this is the same administration that while standing, as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) did just a moment ago, in his comments talking about our troops who are dying for us to have the right to be here, and you and I and all of our colleagues are proud of the fact that we can serve in this United States Congress, and there are people as we speak, and certainly more than 1,700 Americans have died in Iraq, and some substantial number in Afghanistan, and, yet, when they come home to Dover, Delaware, with flag-draped coffins, this administration who is so proud of the flag and all of you who would support its being made a part of a Constitution, refuses to let

the public see the pictures of those persons with those flag-draped coffins, and I might add, punishes the media for trying to access them.

The hypocrisy is so thick, that you can choke on it.

□ 1215

Last night in the Committee on Rules, I offered an amendment to the underlying legislation and I said to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) that I found a way that I can support his measure to put the flag in the Constitution. It came by way of an incident that occurred in Durham, North Carolina on May 25 of this year. Three crosses were burned in Durham; one in front of a church, designed to intimidate people. The cross, the precious cross was burned. And yet we find ourselves here talking about the flag. I wonder about my colleagues which offends them more; or do they, as they do me, both offend me highly.

In 2003, the United States Supreme Court upheld a Virginia law banning cross burning in Virginia. The court ruled the burning of a cross by a terrorist organization such as the Ku Klux Klan is not protected by the first amendment because of the maliciousness and intent to intimidate behind the action.

Justice Sandra O'Connor wrote in the majority's opinion, "While a burning cross does not inevitably convey a message of intimidation, often the cross burner intends that the recipients of the message fear for their lives. And when a cross burning is used to intimidate, few if any messages are more powerful."

Mr. Speaker, as I began my discussion with my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), I asked, When was the last time we saw a flag burn? I have not seen a flag burning in America. And I might add, when it burns abroad it offends me just as much as when it burns in this country, but I have not seen one of those desecrations in quite some time. But cross burnings continue to plague the South and are used by hate groups to incite, intimidate, and, in some instances, harm and murder. Despite this real epidemic, Congress has always been silent on the issue.

Had my amendment been made in order, and it was not considered to be made in order in the Committee on Rules, the House would have been able to debate this important issue for the first time. The House will not be debating that issue, nor will we be debating the myriad of other issues of critical importance to the American people. There are so many other things that this body could be doing today instead of drawing up another way to impede our constitutionally protected rights.

We could be expanding veterans health care benefits. We could be increasing military pay. We could be providing our soldiers with adequate body armor and protection. We could be improving our schools, creating incen-

tives for affordable housing, ensuring our seniors have long-term health care. We could be completing a transportation reauthorization bill and new school construction. These are just a few of the things, in addition to others that I have mentioned, that we could be doing.

Mr. Speaker, are we so insecure in our own patriotism that seeing someone else burning a flag will lead us to question our commitment to this great Nation? Let us ask ourselves the question, What is America? We know that its symbol stands tall no matter the circumstances.

I love this country and everything our flag stands for, even the things with which I do not agree, and they are numerous; for better or for worse, that is the cost we pay for democracy. I ask you to please consider, when you are talking about putting something in the United States Constitution, that you get past political rhetoric and that you understand the serious dynamics that are involved when we are talking about asking two-thirds of the States in this country and two-thirds of this body and the other body to pass something that will allow us to become more insecure.

I tell you, when I see somebody burn the flag, it makes me mad; it does not make me insecure. And that is what ought cause us to be reaching across to each other, because it is at that one point in time when somebody desecrates the flag that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) and I have the exact same view, and that is everybody that is here. Therefore, it is a uniting thing, not a dividing thing between the first amendment rights of people.

Civil liberties are important. I do not like the fools who burn the flag, but I will stand up and protect their right to do so because to take their right means one day somebody might try to take mine.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in response to a number of the points that my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), just made so eloquently.

He asked me a little while ago about the incidences that had occurred, the 119 since 1994, and how many of those were burnings in contrast to how many might be other forms of desecration. I did not have that information for him at the moment, but I do now, and I want to share that with him; 75 of those actually were burnings.

I want to anecdotally mention one of those 75. In April 18, 2005, this occurred in Topeka, Kansas, this burning. Fire and police investigators looked into a case of arson in which flags were burned at the Topeka and Shawnee County Public Library. Someone came into the library grounds between 12:21 a.m. and 1:15 a.m. They lowered the library's flags and they burned them near the building.

Now, it was not illegal then and now to burn your own flag. It was illegal to burn someone else's. But that is the point that I wanted to make; that in fact 75 of 119 were burnings. Furthermore, I want to also mention that the word "desecration" in this constitutional amendment resolution was selected because of its broad nature in encompassing many actions against the flag.

Such broad terms are commonly used in constitutional amendments. For example, free exercise in the first amendment; unreasonable searches and seizures, probable cause, in the fourth amendment; due process and equal protection in the 14th. Thus, it is essential that we continue to use broad terms in constitutional amendments such as the word "desecration" in order to give Congress discretion when it moves to enact implementing legislation. Debate and discussion as to what forms of desecration should be outlawed, such as burning, will come at a later date in Congress.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) was talking about in regard to his own amendment. The Supreme Court decision in 2003, *Virginia v. Black*, held that "a ban on cross burning carried out with the intent to intimidate is proscribable under the first amendment," allowable under the first amendment. So it is really unnecessary to pass a constitutional amendment to prohibit cross burnings, since statutes prohibiting cross burnings with the intent to harm are currently enforceable.

In contrast, the Supreme Court has concluded in *Texas v. Johnson* in 1989 that, 5 to 4 decision, that flag desecration is protected by the first amendment, leaving a constitutional amendment as the only remaining option to protect the flag, since statutes doing so in 50 States, 48 States before 1989, are currently unenforceable.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I for one would like to let my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), know that I am not so weak in my faith that burning of a cross would somehow destroy my faith. And yet I still believe that when somebody burns the cross, that the effect on our society, the chances of a riot, the chances that it will lead to violence are so high that society has a right to protect itself from the inevitable outcome of that kind of action. Furthermore, I do not believe we are acting as a body in order to tell the American people what to do.

I believe we reflect on a bipartisan basis, an overwhelming bipartisan basis, which reflects the will of the people, their desire to see this protection. That is why 50 States have all passed resolutions. Some of these States are very much Democrat States, some very much Republican.

This is not about patriotism or party. This is about the will of the people. We

must respond to the will of the people. I believe in the Constitution as a not easily changeable document, and I respect the idea that we should not change it lightly. But just as this Constitution began without Indians, African Americans, women, or even people below the age of 21 being able to vote, and we have revised and revised and revised to get a more perfect democracy, we too must respond to this generation's request.

This generation's request of us is, in fact, to establish a special respect level, not an overly high one, but a special respect level for the flag. Not because America will somehow be destroyed if one or one million flags are burned, but because the American people have called on this body to offer them an opportunity to amend the Constitution, and we do so here today. We attempt to give the American people that opportunity to revise the Constitution.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) before he leaves the floor, that every time that we have amended the Constitution it has been to expand liberties and rights, not to restrict them. If this amendment passes, this would be the first time in the history of this country that we would pass an amendment that would restrict rights and liberties.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ISSA. I might remind the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my friend, that we limited the terms of how many times someone could run for President as a constitutional amendment. That is fluid document. It may add or subtract. It may reflect the will of the people. The will of the people in our lifetime was to limit the amount of terms that a President could serve, no differently than the question of whether or not you can incite a riot by burning a flag.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Reclaiming my time, I cannot believe my colleague would even try to make such a specious argument, but the fact of the matter is there have only been 15 incidents in a country of 300 million people between the years of 2000 and 2005. There are substantial laws on the books that will prosecute fools who desecrate the flag.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), my very good friend on the House Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. ACKERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I love our flag and that for which it stands. It stands for a Nation founded by people fleeing from oppressors. It stands for freedoms, not the least of which is the freedom of opinion and the unimpeded

expression thereof, including the freedom to protest. This was a Nation founded by protesters.

When our Founding Fathers sought to guarantee these freedoms, they created not a flag, but a Constitution, debating the meaning of each and every word, every amendment of the Bill of Rights, each and every one of which gives people rights. They did not debate a flag. The flag would become a symbol of these rights.

What is the threat to the Republic today that drives us to dilute the Bill of Rights? Well, someone burned the flag once this year. Whatever happened to fighting to the death for somebody's right to disagree?

□ 1230

We now choose instead to react by taking away a form of protest. Most people abhor flag burners; but even a despicable, low-life malcontent has a right to disagree and to disagree in an obnoxious fashion. That is the true test of free expression.

Flag burners are rare, but vile, acts of desecration that have been cited by those who would propose changing our founding document, but these acts do not harm anybody. If a jerk burns a flag, America is not threatened. If a jerk burns a flag, democracy is not under siege. If a jerk burns a flag, freedom is not at risk. We are offended. To change our Bill of Rights because someone offends us is, in itself, unconscionable.

Who bans flag burning? Hitler did. Mussolini did. Saddam Hussein did. Dictators fear flag burners. The reason our flag is different is because it stands for burning the flag.

Though we in proper suits may decry the protesters and the flag burners, protecting their right is the stuff of democracy. The real threat to our society is not the occasional burning of a flag, but the permanent banning of the burners. The real threat is that some of us have now mistaken the flag for a religious icon to be worshipped as would pagans, rather than to be kept as a beloved symbol of our freedom that is to be cherished.

It is not the flag burners who threaten democracy. Rather, it is those who would deny them.

The Constitution this week is being nibbled to death by small men with press secretaries. If the flag burners offend us, do not beat a cowardly retreat by rushing to ban them. Meet their ideas with bigger ideas, for an even better America to protect the flag by protecting democracy, not by retreating from it.

The choice today is substance or symbolism. We cannot kill a flag. It is a symbol; and, yes, patriots have died, but they have died for liberty. They have died for democracy. They have died for the right of the protesters. They died for values.

The flag is a symbol of those values. Saying that people died for the flag is symbolic language. What they really

died for are American principles. The Constitution gives us our rights. The Constitution guarantees our liberties. The Constitution embodies our freedoms. It is our substance. The flag is the symbol for which it stands.

True patriots choose substance over symbolism. Diminish the Constitution by removing but one right and the flag shall forever stand for less. Do not pass this amendment. Do not diminish the Constitution. Do not cheapen our flag.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman from New York in his last presentation, for over 2 centuries the first amendment was already understood to permit flag protection. In fact, before the 1989 case, what he is talking about was not even germane because 48 States had already had in place that the flag was protected. Only Wyoming and Alaska did not have it; and now all 50 States, contrary to what the gentleman is talking about, want this amendment, H.J. Res. 10, to pass so that we have protections for our flag.

So he is acting like there has not been historically, little protection for this flag, but historically, for 2 centuries, the first amendment was in place and the flag was protected. H.J. Res. 10 will not amend the first amendment.

Let us not forget that we are not talking about amending the first amendment or limiting the rights guaranteed under the Bill of Rights. So let us make that perfectly clear.

As I pointed out, for 200 years in this country, the first amendment was understood to permit simple flag protection. That conduct has always and continues to be regulated by the United States Government. That is our job. Both State and Federal criminal codes prohibit conduct that could conceivably be protected by the first amendment; yet their constitutionality is not questioned.

Let me give my colleagues an example. Defacing currency, urinating in the public, pushing over a tombstone, public nudity are all actions which can be utilized to express a particular political or social message, but are unquestionably, unquestionably illegal. Flag desecration was once included in that list as a form of conduct our society chose not to condone. However, the Supreme Court's opinion in 1989 in Johnson and Eichman usurped the people's will in this respect.

So after 1989, then we had this problem. H.J. Res. 10 will simply return to where we were 200 years ago, overturn this erroneous decision. That is all we are doing here, restoring the original meaning to the first amendment that had persisted for over 200 years.

As we stand here today, we have a flag behind us here in the House. That flag was like the flag that we saw on 9/11. Who can forget the iconic photo taken on the terrible day of September 11, 2001, of three New York City

firefighters raising our flag from the rubble of the World Trade Center?

What did that do? That symbolizes America's mourning, but also it symbolized a determination by the American people to pursue justice. How sad it would be to come to the point where we would allow this flag that projects the symbolism of American mourning and the symbolism of a determination to pursue justice, that we would allow it to be burned.

So we are here to move forward on this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would ask the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), my friend, does the gentleman know of any time that we have amended the Bill of Rights in the United States of America?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I think I would ask my colleague why he is against 200 years in this country, when we protected our flag, why is he standing on the floor today not respecting the tradition of this country for 200 years and realizing that all 50 States want us to enact this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, because I believe in the first amendment. That was the first thing done in the United States Constitution; and I believe that in 1777, when the Founders of this Nation established the flag as our symbol that they were correct then and they are correct now.

I do not know whether my colleague was on the floor when I said to him, and I rather suspect he was not, that I resent flag burning, but I respect rights, and I will respect the rights of individuals within the framework of the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights for as long as I am here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), my colleague.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it if the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) does not leave the floor for a moment.

I appreciate very much his lecture about 9/11. I happen to live in New York. I am a New Yorker. I am a New York Representative. I was born in New York, and let me tell the gentleman how proud we are of those firemen. Let me tell the gentleman how proud we are of the act that they did in raising that flag and how proud each and every one of us is of that flag.

But let me also tell the gentleman this: we are proud of that flag because it represents a set of values that are different from al Qaeda's values, from oppressors' values. That flag represents our Constitution, and that Constitution is what makes the difference between us and others.

It is not a flag because it is a different shape or has different colors. It is what it represents, and for the gentleman to stand up and cite why we are against doing this and citing history, we have laws against, as the gentleman from Florida said, public urination or nudity in public. Those laws, could the gentleman tell me where there is a constitutional amendment to ban that? There is none. We take care of that with other laws.

In the history which the gentleman is so fond of citing in this country, never has there been a case where we amended the Founding Fathers' Bill of Rights. We have never amended the Constitution's Bill of Rights. We have never once taken away rights of Americans.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ACKERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York would agree that we are not amending the first amendment or otherwise limiting in any way the guarantees under the Bill of Rights. Is that not true what we are doing?

Mr. ACKERMAN. No, that is not true. That is absolutely not true.

What my colleagues are doing is amending the Constitution which, for the first time since Prohibition, takes away the right; and there was such a hue and cry in Prohibition and that was because more people happened to drink than burn the flag, appropriately so, I might say.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I understand the gentleman is kind to give me this time. It is the gentleman's time, but the point is this is a constitutional amendment. It is not changing the first amendment.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Reclaiming my time, of course it takes away a recognized form of protest and freedom of expression. If a person burns the flag, if they burn someone else's flag, that is a crime. If they urinate in public, as the gentleman's side is so apt to talk about, on the flag, which is a despicable thing to do, there are laws that protect against those things occurring in public.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would further yield, I have one question for the gentleman. If I went to the New York City firefighters who raised our flag on the rubble of the World Trade Center and I said to them, do you want to protect this flag from desecration and burning, what does my colleague think their answer would be?

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, they were there to protect lives and protect Americans. They raised the flag in an act of patriotism, to show why this great country is different from those that attacked us, and that is because we have a Constitution.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleague from Georgia, if he is interested in this colloquy continuing, perhaps it is that he would yield some time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), who may in turn yield time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) and myself and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers at this time. I plan to reserve the balance of my time, but I will be happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) in the interest of continuation of this colloquy.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. Well, we have been through this debate, and in all respect to the gentleman from New York, he has come down here and he pulls a box out and he has the American flag on handkerchiefs and he has got it on his tie. I respect him for doing that because he is really saying that the American flag comes in many forms and people use it to adorn, maybe even upholstery, but that is a little different. That is a little different than taking the flag and burning it.

The fact that when this country was founded and we have all the States up until 1989 supporting the idea of protection of the flag, I mean, that tradition alone, by saying to the American people we are going to forget all that tradition, so have we been wrong?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I—

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I think I have got the time now.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. No, the gentleman does not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Did the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) allocate time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) or the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS)?

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman is saying when we think about it, my good colleague from Florida and New York, were the people in this country wrong for 200 years to protect the flag from desecration?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. No.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, now the gentleman, as a Congressman in this 21st century, is saying they were all wrong, the judge in the Johnson and Eichman case was absolutely right? He was not respecting the 200 years we had and now suddenly out of thin air he has decided to change the courts?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I do not want to create a constitutional morass,

but I had the time and yielded to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), and I tried to reclaim my time. The Chair then permitted the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) to yield time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), which should come after the time that I have utilized.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I think we need a clarification who has the time. I understood that my side had given me 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) will suspend.

Did the gentleman from Georgia initially allocate debate time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) or the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS)?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, he has been very generous with my time. I do not want to take his time away because he is on the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is asking the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) who he initially allocated time to.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time our side has remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) has 1½ minutes remaining after this time has expired. However, the question to the gentleman from Georgia is, who initially did the gentleman allocate time to, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) or the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS)?

□ 1245

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, that was my mistake. I intended to yield that time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) rather than the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS). I apologize for that mistake.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) has 1½ minutes remaining; and, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) has 3 minutes remaining.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) for the parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), who controls the time, yielded 2 minutes, which is an allocation of time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), should not the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) have 3½ minutes even if they are New York minutes?

Mr. Speaker, 1½ plus 2 are 3½ even in Florida.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the understanding of the Chair, upon asking the gentleman from Georgia to clarify his initial allocation of time, that he intended to yield an initial 2 minutes and a subsequent 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) has the time.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Florida yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. STEARNS. I do.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Is what counts in the rules of procedure of the House what the gentleman's intent was or what the gentleman did?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair asked the gentleman from Georgia for a clarification. The gentleman from Georgia initially indicated he was yielding 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida and the Chair did not hear which gentleman from Florida he intended to yield time to. Upon seeking clarification, the gentleman from Georgia indicated he intended to yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) may proceed.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I am going to wrap up here. I did not intend to get into this kind of debate.

Mr. Speaker, only to make my point, as a conservative, when we look at the issue and say there are 200 years of tradition here of protecting the flag, I think we should not throw that tradition out and remember it is only this judge in *Johnson v. Eichman* in 1989 that made that change, and now again we have 50 States that are asking for us as Members of Congress to vote to support H.J. Res. 10.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time for the purpose of closing.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just comment, in the *Johnson* case, it was Justice Scalia that was the fifth vote that made the ruling that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) was speaking of just a moment ago. I would hope that he would know that.

The sum fact of the matter is none of us are in favor of anybody burning a flag. But the simple fact of the matter is all of us ought to be about the business of protecting the rights and the liberties of United States citizens.

What I have said I repeat, and that is I am not so insecure that when I see a fool burn a flag that it makes me anything more than incensed. It does not cause me to lose any respect for my country at all, but the rights of that individual are the things that we must be here to protect.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) indicated this does not implicate free speech. I would simply point out that we see movies all the time. In those movies we see actors dressed up as Nazis, as German soldiers in German World War II trampling and burning the flag. Do we go out and arrest those actors? Of course not, because we know the actors do not mean it; they are playing a role.

But this amendment says if an American citizen to make a point, a point that he disagrees with the actions of his government, were to do the same thing, then we would arrest him. So what are we really saying? It is not the act of the flag burning that matters; it is the point of view associated with the flag burning which is why this is a free speech issue and why we should not pass this amendment.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) for introducing this legislation and to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENBRENNER), the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, for being steadfast and persistent in trying to bring resolution to the issue of flag desecration.

On June 14, 1777, the Continental Congress approved the stars and stripes design as the official flag of the United States in order to designate and protect our ships from friendly fire at sea.

Since 1994, 119 incidents of flag desecration, and yes, 75 of those were flag burnings, have been reported in the United States and its territories. A constitutional amendment will send a strong message of respect for our country and what it represents. Every Memorial Day, civic groups volunteer their time placing flags on the graves of our fallen soldiers. It was said earlier on Flag Day, June 14, that very few of our citizens took their liberty to display their personal flags. It is regrettable. It is regrettable that on Memorial Day, instead of honoring our fallen, our KIAs in this great country, people, many people, most people, in fact, just use it as a long weekend, another day, a holiday, not really remembering. But, of course, we do not throw out Memorial Day just because our citizens are not paying the proper respect.

Whenever a soldier or a government leader dies, a flag is given to his or her family in honor of their service to our country. Our flag means something to these civic groups, these family members, our veterans, our soldiers, and all Americans.

Every day men and women selflessly give of themselves to protect our country and our liberties, and they do not deserve to be dishonored, just as our firefighters and our policemen in the great City of New York gave of themselves on that fateful day of 9/11.

During our war against terrorism, we need to send a strong message to the

enemies of America and the enemies of freedom by protecting the symbol and values of our Nation. With that said, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this rule, to oppose the Watt substitution, and pass the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2475, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 331 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 331

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2475) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes. The bill shall be considered as read. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) One hour of debate on the bill, as amended, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; (2) the further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative Maloney of New York or her designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or demand for division of the question, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. PUTNAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 331 is a structured rule that provides

for consideration of H.R. 2475, authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System.

I am pleased to bring this resolution to the floor for its consideration. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill.

It provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence modified by the amendment printed in part A of the Committee on Rules report accompanying the resolution shall be considered as adopted and shall be considered as read.

It makes in order an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) or her designee which shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and opponent, and all points of order against the amendment are waived.

The rule provides for a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to present for consideration the rule for the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2006. I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and his hard-working ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), for their excellent work on this legislation. More than any other committee in the Congress, we rely on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to do work that we have confidence in and that is accurate and honest. The committee is the eyes and ears of this Congress in the intelligence community. We depend on them to be aware of what the rest of the world and our own community is up to. We put our faith in them to practice oversight and to produce a legislative product that addresses the needs of our intelligence community, and therefore our Nation.

The committee does an outstanding job of working on a bipartisan basis to provide for our men and women who are fighting the war on terror on a variety of fronts.

I want to take a moment to salute those men and women who are working around the globe in a variety of capacities doing so much in a quiet, discreet way for our security and liberty. Linguists, analysts, case officers, mathematicians, and engineers, some of the brightest minds that our Nation produces, work in the intelligence community taking, in many cases, an option that is not as generous as the private sector may be if they were to put that intellect and those talents and skills

into some other capacity in the private sector.

But they do it as a labor of love, as a part of public service identical to that which calls men and women into uniform in the armed services and which calls men and women into our firefighter and police and other first responding capacities. No differently than those uniformed members, the men and women in our intelligence community throughout the world are performing a huge public service for which we can never show enough gratitude and appreciation.

□ 1300

The Intelligence Committee has reported out a bill that continues the House's commitment to the global war on terrorism and to ensuring that intelligence resources are directed in a balanced way toward threats to our national security. This legislation authorizes more than last year's appropriated amount and more than the President's request to continue to fight the war on terror.

The bill does an effective job of balancing our intelligence resources and strengthening human intelligence gathering by increasing the number of case officers and training and support infrastructure. A long-term counterterrorism program is established to reduce the dependence on supplemental appropriations. Additionally, it authorizes the full amount of funds expected for heightened operations for counterterrorism operations and the war in Iraq.

H.R. 2475 enhances the analytic workforce by providing additional linguists and analysts as well as improved training and tools. Furthermore, the bill continues to invest in technical programs, funding systems end to end, investing in R&D and increased use of signature intelligence, and reflects the results of a comprehensive survey to review and rationalize technical collection programs.

For the first time, the Intelligence Authorization Act funds the new Office of the Director of National Intelligence and allows for increased positions. The National Counterterrorism Center is enhanced through improved information sharing activities and collaboration provisions. The bill improves physical and technical infrastructure of intelligence agencies with new facilities.

This authorization bill is a perfect example of how Congress can achieve a bipartisan product that meets the needs of our Nation. Again, I thank Chairman HOEKSTRA, Ranking Member HARMAN, and the members of the committee for their admirable work. I urge Members to support the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. First, let me thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule providing for the consideration of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2006.

First, Mr. Speaker, let me remind my colleagues that Members who wish to do so can go to the Intelligence Committee office to examine the classified schedule of authorizations for the programs and activities of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the national intelligence program. This includes authorizations for the CIA as well as the foreign intelligence and counterintelligence programs within, among other things, the Department of Defense, the National Security Agency, the Departments of State, Treasury and Energy, and the FBI. Also included in the classified documents are the authorizations for the tactical intelligence and related activities and joint military intelligence program of the Department of Defense.

Today more than ever, we must make the creation of a strong and flexible intelligence apparatus one of the highest priorities of this body. The terrorist attacks of September 11, combined with the continuing threat of further attacks, underscore the importance of this legislation, and I am pleased that it has been brought to the floor before the July 4 recess.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while I generally support this bill, it is not closed to improvements. As the Democrats noted in our additional views, this bill is the first authorization bill to be considered since the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 became law last December. The reforms undertaken last year, in the aftermath of two intelligence failures, created a Director of National Intelligence and dramatically reshaped the intelligence community. This authorization bill will therefore help define the authorities, priorities, and direction of the Director of National Intelligence and the entire intelligence community.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the committee rejected the President's paltry request for counterterrorism funding and, instead, fully funded the intelligence community's needs. Fully funding counterterrorism represents bipartisanship and good public policy. Of course, this does not seem to be the first time that this administration does not heed the advice of its own intelligence experts, but I digress.

Let me speak also briefly about the fact that this bill and the report accompanying it are pretty much silent on one of the most salient issues of the day, our military prison at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The allegations of severe human rights abuses at Guantanamo Bay are at best extremely disturbing and at worst unforgivable sins of our Nation, which has always led the fight for human rights. I do not work there, so I cannot speak to the veracity of every single allegation. But I do know that Guantanamo Bay is a stealth prison, an unrecognizable blip on the radar screen of domestic and

international law. Surrounded by a world of laws, treaties, norms and practices, Guantanamo is an unrecognizable entity, a small space where the law simply does not penetrate.

The prisoners are in judicial limbo, with limited access to lawyers and no legal recourse to profess their guilt or innocence or to protect themselves from abuse. In fact, many of them have now been jailed for more than 3 years without even having been charged with a crime. It sounds a bit Kafkaesque to me. Requests from objective outside observers to examine the condition of the prisoners have been rebuffed time and again. The Bush administration seems to trust in only itself to determine whether the prisoners are deserving of legal protections.

I am disheartened by the intelligence authorization bill's silence on this matter. The Members of this body should be greatly concerned with the utter lack of respect for the law or adherence to international agreements that characterize Guantanamo Bay. Former Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis once said, "If the government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law."

Congress has a responsibility to prevent Guantanamo Bay from becoming the personal prison of convenience for the Bush administration to stash people it does not want to suffer legal rights to. This body would be greatly remiss if we shucked that responsibility in favor of turning a blind eye to what very well might be the biggest terrorism recruitment tool since the attacks on September 11.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, this bill provides authorizations and appropriations for some of the most important national security programs in this country. With the adoption of the manager's amendment, which we will hear about in much greater detail presently, I look forward to supporting the bill's ultimate passage.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my colleague with whom I serve on the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

Mr. Speaker, on June 8, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member on the Committee on Government Reform, came before the Committee on Rules asking that two amendments be made in order. One amendment calls for a select committee to be established in Congress to investigate abuses of detainees held under U.S. military custody. The other amendment establishes an independent commission for the same purpose.

Mr. Speaker, these are matters that merit the attention of this House and deserve to be debated and voted upon by the Members of this body. But the majority party on the Rules Committee feels otherwise. The Republican leadership believes it is better to sweep these matters under the rug, hide

them, forget about them, but certainly not investigate them. It makes no difference whether such an inquiry takes place inside the Congress or outside the Congress, any form of independent investigation is out of the question.

But questions about the abuse and torture of detainees simply will not go away, whether it is Guantanamo or Abu Ghraib or the countless other prisons, jails and detention facilities under U.S. control in Afghanistan and Iraq. Every week brings new revelations of abuses.

Mr. Speaker, I do not blame our soldiers for these abuses. It is their leaders who have failed. It is the leaders up and down the chain of command whose incompetence and arrogance have led to a systemic breakdown of standards and codes of conduct that our military has lived by since its creation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a few lines from the June 13 edition of Newsweek. The article is entitled "Good Intentions Gone Bad." In it, Rod Nordland, Newsweek's Baghdad bureau chief, who is departing after 2 years in Iraq, shares a few final thoughts. He writes:

"Two years ago I went to Iraq as an unabashed believer in toppling Saddam Hussein. I knew his regime well from previous visits. WMDs or no, ridding the world of Saddam would surely be for the best, and America's good intentions would carry the day. What went wrong? A lot, but the biggest turning point was the Abu Ghraib scandal. Since April 2004, the liberation of Iraq has become a desperate exercise in damage control. The abuse of prisoners at Abu Ghraib alienated a broad swath of the Iraqi public. On top of that, it didn't work. There is no evidence that all the mistreatment and humiliation saved a single American life or led to the capture of any major terrorist, despite claims by the military that the prison produced actionable intelligence. The most shocking thing about Abu Ghraib was not the behavior of U.S. troops but the incompetence of their leaders."

Mr. Speaker, this is why we should be debating the Waxman amendments. We cannot run and hide from this abuse. It haunts us, Mr. Speaker. It haunts us. If ever a matter needed the light of day, it is this one.

Oppose this rule. Support debate on the Waxman amendments. Restore America's credibility on human rights and military conduct.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD articles from Newsweek and from the Baltimore Sun.

[From Newsweek, Jun. 13, 2005]

GOOD INTENTIONS GONE BAD

(By Rod Nordland)

Two years ago I went to Iraq as an unabashed believer in toppling Saddam Hussein. I knew his regime well from previous visits; WMDs or no, ridding the world of Saddam would surely be for the best, and America's good intentions would carry the day. What went wrong? A lot, but the biggest turning point was the Abu Ghraib scandal.

Since April 2004 the liberation of Iraq has become a desperate exercise in damage control. The abuse of prisoners at Abu Ghraib alienated a broad swath of the Iraqi public. On top of that, it didn't work. There is no evidence that all the mistreatment and humiliation saved a single American life or led to the capture of any major terrorist, despite claims by the military that the prison produced "actionable intelligence."

The most shocking thing about Abu Ghraib was not the behavior of U.S. troops, but the incompetence of their leaders. Against the conduct of the Lynndie Englands and the Charles Graners, I'll gladly set the honesty and courage of Specialist Joseph Darby, the young MP who reported the abuse. A few soldiers will always do bad things, that's why you need competent officers, who know what the men and women under their command are capable of—and make sure it doesn't happen.

Living and working in Iraq, it's hard not to succumb to despair. At last count America has pumped at least \$7 billion into reconstruction projects, with little to show for it but the hostility of ordinary Iraqis, who still have an 18 percent unemployment rate. Most of the cash goes to U.S. contractors who spend much of it on personal security. Basic services like electricity, water and sewers still aren't up to prewar levels. Electricity is especially vital in a country where summer temperatures commonly reach 125 degrees Fahrenheit. Yet only 15 percent of Iraqis have reliable electrical service. In the capital, where it counts most, it's only 4 percent.

The most powerful army in human history can't even protect a two-mile stretch of road. The Airport Highway connects both the international airport and Baghdad's main American military base, Camp Victory, to the city center. At night U.S. troops secure the road for the use of dignitaries; they close it to traffic and shoot at any unauthorized vehicles. More troops and more helicopters could help make the whole country safe. Instead the Pentagon has been drawing down the number of helicopters. And America never deployed nearly enough soldiers. They couldn't stop the orgy of looting that followed Saddam's fall. Now their primary mission is self-defense at any cost—which only deepens Iraqis' resentment.

The four-square-mile Green Zone, the one place in Baghdad where foreigners are reasonably safe, could be a showcase of American values and abilities. Instead the American enclave is a trash-strewn wasteland of Mad Max-style fortifications. The traffic lights don't work because no one has bothered to fix them. The garbage rarely gets collected. Some of the worst ambassadors in U.S. history are the GIs at the Green Zone's checkpoints. They've repeatedly punched Iraqi ministers, accidentally shot at visiting dignitaries and behave (even on good days) with all the courtesy of nightclub bouncers—to Americans and Iraqis alike. Not that U.S. soldiers in Iraq have much to smile about. They're overworked, much ignored on the home front and widely despised in Iraq, with little to look forward to but the distant end of their tours—and in most cases, another tour soon to follow. Many are reservists who, when they get home, often face the wreckage of careers and family.

I can't say how it will end. Iraq now has an elected government, popular at least among Shiites and Kurds, who give it strong approval ratings. There's even some hope that the Sunni minority will join the constitutional process. Iraqi security forces continue to get better trained and equipped. But Iraqis have such a long way to go, and there are so many ways for things to get even worse. I'm not one of those who think Amer-

ica should pull out immediately. There's no real choice but to stay, probably for many years to come. The question isn't "When will America pull out?"; it's "How bad a mess can we afford to leave behind?" All I can say is this: last one out, please turn on the lights.

[From the Baltimore Sun, June 5, 2005]

CLOSE CAMP DELTA
(By Michael Posner)

For many around the world, the detention facility at the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, has become one of the most prominent, negative symbols of America's departure from the rule of law since 9/11.

Camp Delta, as the prison on Guantanamo is called, holds more than 520 men from about 40 countries. Many of these people have been detained there for more than three years; none has been given any indication of when, or even if, he will be released. The U.S. government has classified all of the detainees as "enemy combatants."

While the term is not recognized in international human rights or humanitarian law, it has provided the U.S. government with a rationale for denying detainees any rights whatsoever, either under the Geneva Conventions (the laws of war) or U.S. criminal law. This situation has prompted some Bush administration officials to dub Guantanamo "the legal equivalent of outer space." This label would also apply to the dozens of secret U.S. detention sites in Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan and Jordan and aboard ships at sea.

But just as Guantanamo has become a powerful negative symbol, it has the potential to be a positive one if the United States is willing to take steps to recognize the possibility. One step, and it is a bold one, would be to shut down the Guantanamo prison—to close its doors and, in doing so, open a public debate among members of Congress, military officers and intelligence and law enforcement leaders on interrogation and detention practices around the world.

Shuttering Guantanamo not only would allow the United States to broadcast to the world its commitment to the rule of law—by moving all security detainees into an established legal process—it also would serve America's security interests. Those around the world who use the symbol of Guantanamo to fuel anti-American sentiments would lose one of their most potent rallying cries. And autocratic governments no longer would be able to hide behind America's example, as they do now, in justifying their own practices of indefinite detention and abuse.

The closing of Guantanamo would, by its very nature, require an evaluation of all the locations where the United States is holding security prisoners because Guantanamo derives much of its infamy from what it has wrought: Guantanamo was the testing ground for coercive interrogation techniques. Torture was exported to other facilities from there.

In the spring of 2003, Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld explicitly approved 24 interrogation techniques for Guantanamo, including "dietary manipulation," "environmental manipulation," "sleep adjustment" and "isolation," all of which has been previously prohibited by U.S. law and explicit military policy. He did so despite strenuous objections from senior military lawyers, the FBI and others in the government. This policy is still in place.

By mid-2003, the military extended the Guantanamo rules to Iraq. In fact, in August 2003, the Pentagon sent the Guantanamo commander, Maj. Gen. Geoffrey Miller, to Abu Ghraib prison, reportedly with the instruction to "Gitmo-ize" the Iraqi prisons.

The revelation of pictures from Abu Ghraib last spring tells part of that story.

But the story is much bigger—and more troubling—than what those photos depict. Consider this: Since December 2002, 108 people have died in U.S. custody, according to Pentagon figures. Of these deaths, no less than 28 were criminal homicides, the Defense Department acknowledges. The victims were tortured to death.

An official investigation into the cases of two young men who were beaten to death at a U.S.-run facility in Bagram, Afghanistan, revealed that more than two dozen soldiers were involved in these deaths. The interrogators, believe that they could deviate from the well-tested rules because, as one said, "there was the Geneva Conventions for enemy prisoners of war, but nothing for terrorists."

Despite its benefits, the prospect of Guantanamo being closed any time soon is unlikely. Last week, Vice President Dick Cheney said of the prison: "What we're doing down there has, I think, been done perfectly appropriately." And yet, the vice president's assertion flies in the face of leaked FBI and International Red Cross reports as well as comments by a former U.S. military translator who published his observations of detainee mistreatment and sexual humiliation.

What can be done when there is such a discrepancy between the facts and the official interpretation of them? In a democracy, the best way to deal with this is openness: Congress should authorize the creation of an independent, bipartisan commission to conduct a thorough investigation of U.S. detention and interrogation policies worldwide. This would allow the United States to assess what went wrong and why and to recommend corrective action.

Until Congress does this, Guantanamo and the other U.S. detention centers will continue to serve as the symbol of America's tarnished reputation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and privileged to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the distinguished ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his service both on the Rules Committee and on the Intelligence Committee, and I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) as well for his comments earlier in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question so that we can have a debate on the Waxman amendment. Yesterday, we had an open rule for the Defense Appropriations Act which funds the intelligence community. I fail to see why we cannot have an open rule for the authorization bill for those same intelligence programs. I also think it is sad that the leadership scheduled consideration of this authorization bill after our vote on the appropriations bill. This makes little sense and erodes our ability to establish clear guidance for how money will be spent.

Mr. Speaker, this rule should have made in order all of the amendments

that were offered. Only 10 amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee. Of those, nine were offered by Democrats, and of those nine, only one was made in order. Each amendment was responsible. Each deserves full consideration on the House floor. Members on both sides of the aisle should have an opportunity to debate the important issues raised by these amendments, but as a result of this unnecessarily restrictive rule, neither Republicans nor Democrats will have that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I want to highlight one amendment that the Rules Committee will not let us debate, the Waxman amendment to establish an independent commission on detainee issues. Detentions and interrogations are vital tools. We need those tools. But they must take place according to our laws and our values. To do anything less puts our own troops in harm's way and erodes our moral credibility in the world.

Today, our intelligence professionals operate in what I call a "fog of law," a confusing patchwork of laws, treaties, memos and policies. The Intelligence Committee's oversight subcommittee is conducting a serious bipartisan investigation into the practice of renditions and interrogations under the able leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER). But this investigation is largely classified. We also need a public unclassified investigation so that the public can have confidence that our Constitution and our laws are respected. A public bipartisan investigation will help us learn precisely what happened, who should be accountable at senior as well as operational levels, and how to fix the problems.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, I will enter into the RECORD an op-ed from the June 7 Washington Post by civil rights attorney Floyd Abrams, former Representative Bob Barr, and Ambassador Tom Pickering, which called for the creation of an independent commission. They wrote: "Only with such a commission are we likely to enact the reforms needed to restore our credibility among the nations of the world."

I agree. Shutting off the lights at Guantanamo will not solve the problem. Only Congress can solve the problem by addressing the policies underlying Guantanamo. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution states that it is Congress's responsibility to make rules concerning captures on land and water, and that is why, in addition to calling for this independent commission, I believe we need bipartisan legislation. The safety of our troops and our moral credibility in the world are on the line.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this restrictive rule and the previous question.

The material previously referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 7, 2005]

JUSTICE BEFORE POLITICS

(By Floyd Abrams, Bob Barr and Thomas Pickering)

After the attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, came widespread shock and horror—and some tough questions. Could the United States have prevented this catastrophe? What corrective action might we take to protect ourselves from other terrorist attacks?

After political struggles and initial resistance by many political leaders, Congress and the president created the Sept. 11 commission in 2002. This bipartisan group of 10 prominent Americans was charged with conducting an independent and complete investigation of the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11 and with providing recommendations for preventing such disasters. In July 2004 the commission released its report, and in December Congress passed legislation to implement many of its recommendations.

In the spring of 2004, the scandal involving the abuse of prisoners at Abu Ghraib became public. Additional allegations of abuse surfaced in connection with prisoners detained by the United States at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and elsewhere. Many Americans asked themselves the same painful questions about these allegations: How could such terrible actions have taken place? Who was responsible? What reforms might we implement to prevent such problems? Once again, a year later, these questions remain unanswered.

We believe that the American public deserves answers. We are members of the bipartisan Liberty and Security Initiative of the Constitution Project, which is based at Georgetown University's Public Policy Institute. We have joined with other members of the initiative—Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives—to call for the establishment of an independent bipartisan commission to investigate the issue of abuse of terrorist suspects. We urge Congress and the president to immediately create such a commission and to use the Sept. 11 commission as a model.

No investigation completed to date has included recommendations on how mistreatment at detention facilities might be avoided. Even the Pentagon's much-heralded report by Vice Adm. Albert T. Church, completed in March, concluded only that there were "missed opportunities in the policy development process" and that these opportunities "should be considered in the development of future interrogation policies."

Establishing an independent, bipartisan commission would also be beneficial for U.S. relationships abroad. The abuse of terrorist suspects in U.S. custody has undermined the United States' position in the world. This is a time when we should be making extra efforts to reach out to Muslims and to ask them to work with us in the war against terrorism. Instead, our failure to undertake a thorough and credible investigation has created severe resentment of the United States.

An independent bipartisan investigation can generate widespread acceptance and support for its findings. Only with such a commission are we likely to enact the reforms needed to restore our credibility among the nations of the world.

We must move beyond the partisan battles of our highly charged political climate. To provide a credible investigation and a plan for corrective action, and to show the world that the United States takes seriously its obligations to uphold the rule of law, we urge Congress and the president to establish a commission to investigate abuse of terrorist suspects.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) as it relates to these issues. It reflects a legitimate disagreement over the direction that this investigation should take, whether it should be based in the legislative branch or based in the executive branch or some combination, which has been the history.

In fact, here in our own Congress, the Senate has had eight hearings on detainee abuse, and three on Abu Ghraib specifically. General Myers, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs; the Chief of Staff of the Army; the Secretary of Defense; and the Acting Secretary of the Army have all conducted independent reviews. There are 12 other Department of Defense reviews that have occurred, and the House Committee on Armed Services in this body has held three hearings and numerous briefings.

The legislative branch has been diligent in their oversight responsibility. And I appreciate that there are differences on this, but I particularly appreciate the way that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have handled this. Unlike in the Senate where the detainee abuse was equated with the regime of Pol Pot and Hitler and Stalin, there is a measured approach to disagreement in this Chamber, and I think that that is the responsible approach, unlike the direction that the Senate has gone. To equate Guantanamo Bay with regimes that murdered millions of people is absurd, and it is dangerous, and it gives aid and comfort to the enemy.

As the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services in this body pointed out, detainees in Guantanamo are provided their own prayer rugs. If that were done in the public school system, it would be against the law. They are called to prayer five times a day. If that were done on the average high school intercom system, it would be a violation of the law. They are fed three nutritious meals per day at an average of \$12 per detainee per day. If we multiplied what we spend on the school lunch program times three meals, they would be receiving less than a detainee in Guantanamo Bay.

And because of the ongoing judicial review that our government is engaged in with those detainees, at the end of that process, 234 detainees so far have been released from Guantanamo. And to show their great gratitude, at least a dozen of them have been identified as returning to the fight against American servicemen and -women.

I think that it is important that we keep those facts in mind, as well, as we move through this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before yielding to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), I would

just say to my friend from Florida that this judicial review that he talks about evidently is going to take place forever.

It is not about food, Mr. Speaker. The detainees are properly fed. But they cannot see their relatives. Most of them cannot see a lawyer, and most of them have not been told what they are charged with. When I say it is Kafkaesque, Franz Kafka wrote the book "The Trial" that said how horrible it was to be in a situation where one does not know their accusers, they do not know what they are charged with, and they are convicted of something in sitting there. We cannot do that in this country. It is not about food. It is about rights. It is about human rights and dignity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been over a year since we saw the horrific photographs of the torture of the prisoners in Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq. Yet in Congress, we have ignored our fundamental responsibility to investigate this issue. And it is not just Abu Ghraib, but other prison camps as well where we are hearing more and more reports of instances of disrespect of the Koran and denial of human rights to detainees.

Under our system of checks and balances, the House of Representatives has a constitutional duty to ensure proper oversight of the executive branch, and for this reason I submitted an amendment to this bill to create either a select committee of the House of Representatives to examine the matter or an independent commission to conduct such an investigation. But the Republican leadership blocked both amendments. They do not want an investigation inside the House or outside by an independent group. The independent commission, I believe, would have filled this huge oversight vacuum. It was denied, and that is why I am in opposition to the previous question on the rule and the rule itself.

The reports of detainee abuse are undermining one of our Nation's most valuable assets, our reputation and respect for human rights. And they are endangering our Armed Forces and inciting hatred against the United States. As Senator BIDEN said, Guantanamo is the "greatest propaganda tool for the recruitment of terrorists worldwide."

Some of the allegations that have been replayed over and over again around the world may not be true. President Bush calls them "absurd." But we will not know what is true and what is not true unless we investigate. And when we refuse to conduct thorough, independent investigations, the rest of the world thinks we have something to hide. When we ignore our constitutional obligations, we are not doing the administration any favor. A

lack of oversight leads to a lack of accountability, and no accountability breeds arrogance and abuse of power.

Over the past year, more and more instances of detainee abuse from a growing number of locations around the world have come to light. In just the past few weeks, new evidence emerged of the desecration of the Koran at Guantanamo Bay; the involvement of Navy Seals in beating detainees in Iraq; and the gruesome, ultimately fatal torture of Afghans at the U.S. detention center at Bagram Airbase in Afghanistan. It is time for this House to put aside political calculations and fulfill our constitutional oversight responsibilities.

Let me just point out to my colleagues that we have not had an investigation since Abu Ghraib. The House held only 5 hours of public hearings in the Committee on Armed Services to investigate the abuses. In contrast, the House spent 140 hours taking witness testimony to examine whether President Clinton mishandled his Christmas card list. What is more important for the use of oversight and investigative powers of the House?

While the Senate review has been more extensive, it has not involved comprehensive public review of all relevant agencies and personnel, nor has it produced comprehensive conclusions regarding individual accountability and necessary corrective actions.

We must do our job. We need to examine these allegations and take our oversight responsibilities seriously. I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Unquestionably, Congress's responsibility to properly oversee the activities of the entire Federal Government is preeminent, and that is why I am proud that, under the leadership of the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER), they have had hearings. In the Senate they have had hearings. And today, as we speak, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence also has an oversight subcommittee devoted to investigating all of these issues.

Mr. Speaker, to elaborate on that, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), the distinguished chairman of that committee.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule. And before I move on to address some of the discussion that has been on the floor today, let me talk about some of the issues in the rule; and I think later on we will have an opportunity to talk about what may be unusual in this bill.

But as my colleagues on the other side today may try to destroy, we have developed a bill that will set a direction for the intelligence community and we have done it in a bipartisan way. We have checked the issues as to whether the bill is sufficient in terms

of the resources to have an effective intelligence community. We have made important decisions as to the relative balance between HUMINT and our technical capabilities. We have made important decisions about the direction of our technical capabilities, and we have done it on a bipartisan basis.

This bill came out of committee with a voice vote. It shows the continued commitment of the House to support the global war on terrorism and our troops deployed abroad. We attempted this year to keep ancillary issues out of the bill, to focus the full attention of the committee on careful oversight and review of our Nation's intelligence programs. Our goal was to properly align the resources of those programs to counter the threats facing our Nation. I appreciate the efforts of the Committee on Rules to keep floor debate similarly focused on the programs that are authorized in the bill and related issues.

Again, we are setting a strategic direction for where we think the intelligence community needs to go. There will be some changes that were made as a result of the rule that we will vote on in the next few minutes, and these again were an attempt to make sure that there was not confusion about what direction we wanted to go in, what we wanted to get done, and make sure that the underlying direction for the reform of the intelligence community was the bill that was signed into law by the President last December.

I will say that I agree with some of my colleagues on the other side. My ranking member said it is the responsibility of Congress to do its work. Congress will do its work. We have been doing our work. We have had a bipartisan, constructive effort, led by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER), to take a look at the allegations that are out there. We have been investigating these issues.

My colleague here says we have not been doing any work. My colleague has not done the basics. He maybe could have asked, has the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence on the House side done anything to take a look at the alleged allegations or the abuses at Guantanamo, the intelligence community's relationships to Abu Ghraib? I think my ranking member on the other side has said that we have had a constructive, bipartisan effort to take a look at the allegations, to take a look at the role of the intelligence community, and to take a look at how we move forward on these types of things. But sometimes people do not even want to raise the basic questions and get the basic information that they need.

These are serious issues. The information that the folks may have in Guantanamo may save American lives. It will make our war on terror more effective.

Should these allegations be investigated? Absolutely. Are they being investigated? Absolutely. And members

on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence know that that work has been going on, and it has been going on in a very constructive and a very effective method.

□ 1330

I look forward to passing this bill today. I look forward to this committee continuing the work that Congress has asked it to do, and us going back and doing it in an effective way, to make sure that we will have an effective intelligence community. It is time to stop bashing our troops and our intelligence community. These people put their lives on the line every day. It is time to show them some support.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend and classmate, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this restrictive rule for not making in order the Waxman amendment to provide for an investigation by a bipartisan, independent commission of the detainee abuses alleged at Abu Ghraib, Guantanamo Bay, and other sites.

Let me say at the outset that the men and women in our armed services ought to be praised for their selfless sacrifices. They deserve not to have their names and their good works associated with the torture and abuse that has been alleged in newspapers and other reports. That is why it is so important to have a complete and full investigation and to receive assurances that torture and abuse are not standard operating procedure in our armed forces, even if torture was authorized by Secretary Rumsfeld and Attorney General Gonzales. It is not authorized by Congress or by the American people who ultimately get to have the final say.

It also bothers me that these detainees do not have any way of asserting their innocence. The President says they are all terrorists, but what if some of them were cases of mistaken identity? What if some of them had nothing to do with terrorism? What if they have a similar name or a similar appearance, but are indeed factually innocent of all charges?

It seems to me that if the government is so sure that everyone we are holding is a terrorist, there should be no trouble convincing a court, a judge, or a military court. That would be preferable to having the government assert that all of these people are terrorists, just trust us. We cannot allow that type of abuse of power to continue in our name.

This assertion of the right to hold people forever, with no specific evidence and no due process, has not been asserted in an English-speaking country since before Magna Carta, 800 years ago, until this President had the nerve to besmirch the good name of the

United States by making such an assertion. This is not how America became the Shining City on a Hill so admired by people the world over.

No executive should be permitted the power to lock people up forever without ever having to prove their guilt. That is a power that I would trust to no man, no king, no dictator, and no President.

Let me say one other thing. Torture and abuse of prisoners is not just a shameful violation of human rights, it does not work. People under torture will say anything. Intelligence professionals know better than to believe or to rely on information extracted under torture. Torture and abuse of detainees is wrong for so many reasons. It is a horrendous practice, it produces nothing but shame and more enemies for the United States, and anger from the rest of the world.

We need to aggressively investigate these abuses and put safeguards and policies into place to prevent them from ever happening again.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Perhaps we should remind the gentleman of some of the 545 people who are being detained in Guantanamo; 545, by the way, is fewer people than are in my county's jail on a Saturday night.

But of those 545 people who killed innocent women and children, they included a detainee named Katani who was stopped before he could board one of the planes used to strike the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, or taking care of Osama bin Laden's body guards, other members of al Qaeda and other terrorist networks and members of the Taliban. These are not your average, run-of-the-mill pick-pockets and thieves. They are hardened terrorists who have pledged everything to destroy American service men and women, to come into our homeland and wreak havoc and cause mayhem and cause death and destruction within these borders of the United States of America. They are being monitored. They are under ongoing judicial review. The eyes of the world, as this debate has evidenced, are on Guantanamo.

These are individuals who represent the very worst in our global society who would do anything to bring us harm. Yet we seem to lose all of that perspective in this very dramatic, theatrical debate that began in the Senate when there was an equation of Guantanamo with the regimes of Stalin and Hitler and Pol Pot which resulted in the torture and mutilation and death of millions of human beings. And for this similar equation to be made on the House floor that we, in our activities in Guantanamo, are even remotely close to those regimes is out of bounds.

There have been numerous Department of Defense investigations into detainee abuse, numerous House Committee on Armed Services hearings on detainee abuse, Senate committee hearings on detainee abuse, and ongoing

Intelligence subcommittee reviews of what is going on there.

It is important that we step back and understand that this is an intelligence authorization bill that gives our men and women the tools they need to fight people around the world that we would not invite over for dinner; people who would do everything in their power to bring down our society, our form of government, our cloak of safety. Let us keep those things in mind when we go forward with this debate about Guantanamo and Abu Ghraib.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just one thing for my friend from Florida: Charge it and prove it. That is all. This is a great Nation. We can charge those folks with a crime, and we can prove that they did what the gentleman said.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at this point to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

We have been led to believe that the use of torture in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Guantanamo Bay, Cuba were isolated incidents; that murder, sexual assault, and physical abuse were the work of a few low-ranking guards who are now being brought to justice.

The new evidence indicates we have been misled.

Recent news accounts have detailed the deaths of two detainees in 2002 at the Bagram Collection Point in Afghanistan during interrogation by military intelligence. One man was hung by his arms in his jail cell for days and beaten so severely in the legs that he died, even though, as the newspapers reported, soldiers involved in the detention believed that the man was innocent.

Despite being ruled homicide by the coroners, the deaths were described by a military spokesman as resulting from natural causes. In the meantime, the officer was promoted and placed in charge of interrogations in Iraq's Abu Ghraib Prison.

But this story is not about low-ranking soldiers who independently ran afoul of the system; it is not a matter of a few bad apples. It is one tale in what is emerging to be a pattern of systematic abuse carried out with the knowledge and approval of senior military and civilian officials.

How do we know that the Defense Department and senior military commanders knew what was going on? Because their own documents say so. Their own documents show that the general in charge of our troops in Afghanistan knew that unapproved techniques were being used in those interrogatories. So what did he do? He made

a list of these techniques and sent them to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who were looking for ways to alter interrogations in Guantanamo Bay.

In fact, the only time the general in charge of U.S. forces in Afghanistan seems to have issued any written policy is when he recommended that the Geneva Convention techniques be removed for everyone, regardless of whether or not they were tied to al Qaeda or the Taliban.

So let me sum it up. Advanced torture techniques were developed and used in Afghanistan and resulted in the deaths of multiple detainees. The deaths were covered up and the investigations were stalled. The techniques were shared with the interrogators at Guantanamo Bay and then spread to Iraq where the same people responsible for the deaths in Afghanistan were put in charge of the Abu Ghraib prison.

From Afghanistan to Guantanamo to Abu Ghraib, torture, lies, and coverup. This is not an accident, this is a pattern of abuse.

I want to enter into the RECORD an editorial from my hometown paper on this.

That is why I join my colleagues in calling for the creation of an independent commission on detainee abuse. The leadership in the House and, more specifically, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services have proven both negligent and incapable of dealing with this issue as they have looked the other way and led the country to continue to believe that this is only a few bad apples, a few malcontents that went about it the wrong way when, in fact, the evidence from our own Defense Department tells us differently and has irreparably damaged the reputation of the United States, and has cast doubt on our foreign policy, and it is a new recruitment tool, as so many have commented, both in the intelligence community and in the Congress, that raises the likelihood that U.S. troops captured by enemy combatants or terrorists will be killed or tortured. It gives the radical opponents of the United States and the insurgents the fuel to feed the insurgency against U.S. soldiers and the new Iraqi Government.

The failure of this administration, which so often demands accountability of others to deal with this issue in an honest and forthright fashion, undermines our ability to implement the strategy for success in Iraq and Afghanistan and tears down our forces.

SUSPICIOUS TREATMENT

First, there were the sickening photos smuggled out of Abu Ghraib prison a year ago that shocked the world and fueled anti-American sentiment throughout the Middle East. Then, there were allegations from prisoners recently freed from Guantanamo Bay that U.S. military guards had beaten false confessions out of them and desecrated the Quran. Then, earlier this month, the New York Times reported that military interrogators at a U.S. prison in Afghanistan had killed detainees during questioning, then tried to cover up the cause of death. The in-

terrogators didn't believe one of the men was involved in terrorism, but had beaten him to death—allegedly by accident—anyway.

Now, Amnesty International U.S.A. has released a scathing report calling the U.S. Navy Base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, “the gulag of our times.” The report's authors accuse Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, Attorney General Alberto Gonzales and other top U.S. officials of being “architects of torture.”

The human rights watchdog organization called on foreign governments to use international law to investigate U.S. officials for their abuse of detainees accused of having terrorist ties.

Meanwhile, the Associated Press has obtained 1,000 pages of U.S. government tribunal transcripts under a Freedom of Information Act lawsuit that offers chilling, firsthand accounts of alleged prisoner abuse. In one case, a Guantanamo Bay prisoner told a military panel that American soldiers had beaten him so badly, he now wets his pants.

Vice President Dick Cheney insists that the prisoners are “peddling lies” and that the Guantanamo detainees have been “well-treated, treated humanely and decently.” President Bush blasted the Amnesty report Tuesday, calling it “absurd.”

Yet, it is quite unsettling that prisoners in Guantanamo, Afghanistan and Iraq have told strikingly similar stories.

Bush administration officials' unapologetic defense of military conduct at Guantanamo and other U.S. military prisons—in the face of mounting evidence of serious problems—is symptomatic of its increasingly familiar refusal to acknowledge mistakes and take responsibility. This arrogant stonewalling must not be allowed, especially when so much is at stake.

The well-publicized mistreatment of Muslim detainees at U.S.-run military prisons has severely damaged the United States' reputation abroad. It is the height of hypocrisy to talk of spreading democracy while our government tramples all over individual civil liberties. In the United States, a person is innocent until proven guilty, yet Muslim detainees are essentially guilty until proven innocent. Nearly 600 people have been held without charges. Up until a year ago, they could not even challenge their detentions in U.S. courts. The U.S. government had argued that as foreigners on foreign soil, they had no legal recourse, which is absurd as well as un-American.

It is high time that President Bush and Congress appoint a bipartisan panel to investigate the allegations of abuse of terrorist suspects. People on both sides of the ideological spectrum have called for such a commission, ranging from conservative former U.S. Rep. Bob Barr, R-Ga., to the Center for American Progress on the left.

If, as Rumsfeld claims, released detainees are a bunch of liars, the administration has nothing to hide.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Perhaps the gentleman, out of his concern for torture, would read into the RECORD the similar treatments, the abuse, the torture, the behavior shown Jessica Lynch. Perhaps the gentleman would also read into the RECORD the actions of the gentlemen who boarded American airplanes and crashed them into the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. Perhaps, out of his sense of concern about torture, he would enter into the RECORD transcripts and videos of the beheadings that have been taking place in Iraq. Perhaps the gen-

tleman, out of his sense of concern about torture, would cover those bad apples, those bad actors, and the actions that are being taken against them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in opposition to any further investigation of either what is taking place at Guantanamo Bay with our detainees or further investigation of Abu Ghraib.

I want to speak about Guantanamo first, because I heard some of the reports when we first brought detainees there, and I went down and visited. I walked among the prisoners, I saw the housing, I saw how they were treated. I was asked what I thought when I saw the whole thing, and I want to use my quote here on the floor. I said, “I thought it was too good for the bastards.”

I stand here today appalled at my colleagues who, in fact, are concerned about the rights of mass murderers. And that is exactly what we have here. We have international mass murderers, enemy combatants. They had no consideration, in support of a regime, the al Qaeda regime and Osama bin Laden, who slaughtered thousands of people on our soil, and many of whom were both Americans and internationals.

What right did they respect of Barbara Olson, who worked for our Committee on Government Reform, whose plane crashed into the Pentagon that morning? And I remember Barbara. What right did they respect of Neal Levin, who I met with at the World Trade Centers, who was trapped, along with everyone who helped me and our Subcommittee on Aviation, who were all murdered on the morning of September 11 when they were in the Windows on the World restaurant? What right did they defend of those people?

How quickly we forget September 11. I am reading the book “102 Minutes.” I wish everyone would read it, about the thousands of people who were left trapped in the World Trade Center. What rights did these people who supported that activity exercise?

Abu Ghraib, if I hear one more thing about that and the actions of our military folks; someone described “horrific torture.” I saw worse things at fraternity houses in college than what our troops were involved in. And to continue the harassment.

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) brought into the Committee on International Relations two prisoners; one, I recall, was from Abu Ghraib. I did not see anyone from the other side there, I did not see anyone from the press there when they described their treatment under Saddam Hussein. Do my colleagues know how he dealt with overcrowding? He took them out and slaughtered them. I did not see anyone from the other side concerned about the rights of those prisoners.

One gentleman told us how he was taken from Abu Ghraib Prison; well, he described not only the beheadings, but the limb amputations, the pulling out of tongues, the electrical shocks. How dare anyone from the House or the other body compare the treatment our troops afforded this scum of the earth?

What about an investigation of the 300,000 mass graves that our troops have uncovered and the treatment that those people received.

Finally, again, that one prisoner, and no one here bothered on the other side to even attend the meeting with the prisoners to hear how Saddam Hussein treated them. He described how he was taken out, he and others, and they were all shot, and the bulldozer pushed over dirt on them; he was shot five times, and only managed to crawl away and somehow survive to tell how the other side truly tortures.

□ 1345

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I am convinced of some things: some of my colleagues just do not get it when it comes to human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the rule with a very simple question: What is the House Republican leadership afraid of? We say we want to promote democracy around the world. We say we want to set a good example to others, and yet the House leadership seeks to block a vote today. That is what this argument is about, a vote today on the Waxman amendment, which would simply create an independent, bipartisan commission to investigate abuses at Abu Ghraib, Guantanamo Bay, and other places around the world.

Unfortunately, the only example we seem to be setting these days is the example of the ostrich, to bury our heads in the sand, to ignore the facts, to ignore the truth.

The Bush administration and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that the reports of human rights abuses at these facilities have been greatly exaggerated. Then what are they afraid of? The chairman of the Intelligence Committee just says these are serious issues. They are serious issues.

We do not want quarter-truths; we do not want half-truths. Let us get at the full truth, the good, the bad and the ugly. People around the world look to the United States, not just for the statements we make, but for the actions we take. And Americans have been shocked at the reports of abuses because they know these actions do not reflect our values, and that is what this is about, our values.

And they do not represent us as a people. The United States throughout its history has been a great beacon of human rights. And very sadly, that

beacon has been dimmed by the abuses that have been taking place. And the best way to reclaim our credibility on this issue is to squarely face the facts and those abuses.

We must lead by our example. We must show we will not run from the truth even when it is unpleasant. Only by confronting the truth can we learn from our mistakes. Only by examining our own conduct can we credibly talk about the misconduct of others. Let us show the world that a strong, competent Nation does not run from or hide from the truth. Let us once again lead by example.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), the seeker of that truth, the chairman of the oversight subcommittee tasked with looking into alleged abuse.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding and commend him on the handling of this rule, but also in helping us put this whole issue into greater context.

Because, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for us to remind ourselves that this bill contains a number of things which try to help defend the country, try to help keep us all safer, try to prevent gross inhumane acts of slaughter by the terrorists, which we know they are intent upon committing.

And so I think it is important as we focus down on some of these specific issues, and we should talk about them, to keep the larger context in mind. The gentleman from Florida has helped to do that. In a little bit, I want to talk in greater length about the oversight subcommittee, because I think it is important to say that the chairman of the Intelligence Committee and the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee, at the beginning of this Congress, decided to create a special oversight subcommittee of the House Intelligence Committee.

And our charge is to focus at greater depth and with greater persistency on some of the key intelligence issues which we face. And we take that job very seriously. And I think we can do the job very seriously, in part because we usually do not do our job in front of the cameras. We do not do our job for partisanship.

We do not come out on the floor, in press conferences or in other places, and try to bash the administration or to protect the administration. We try to be tough, but fair. And that is the way that real oversight, particularly in the area of national security, ought to be done, rather than posturing and other things that we have seen from time to time. The problem is the work you do in the Intelligence Committee cannot be talked about openly. And so there is very little one can say about the specifics.

But just because we cannot come and detail all of our activities and some of

what we found and what more we have to do, one should never take that to mean that there is not serious oversight and investigation ongoing, because there is.

And, in fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe that worldwide terrorism presents a number of challenges to us. It is absolutely true, as many of the speakers have said, that we must maintain our American values, and at the same time try to prevent acts of terrorism.

Our problem is, when we just focus on one part of that equation, when we forget that the purpose here is to prevent acts of terrorism, then I think we become unbalanced, our rhetoric becomes more sensational, and unfortunately I think the American people do not benefit from such talk.

I can only say that with my partner, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER), and other members of the subcommittee, with our bipartisan staff, we take our job very seriously. And we will pursue that investigation very seriously. And we will try to make sure that American values are maintained, and at the same time our troops, our homeland security folks, our policemen and others, have the information they need to keep us safe. We will keep both goals in mind.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership and for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to engage today in a colloquy with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), our ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. And let me first thank the gentlewoman for her consistent leadership on so many national security issues.

Let me just say briefly that I appreciate this opportunity to discuss an issue very briefly that is of critical importance, that is, making sure that the United States Government is not involved in violating the will of any people anywhere in the world which duly elects a government through democratic means.

In 1982, Congress passed the Boland amendment, which prohibited the Federal Government from using taxpayer dollars for the purpose of overthrowing the Government of Nicaragua. I offered an amendment to this intelligence authorization bill that broadens this concept to ensure that our Federal intelligence dollars are not used to support groups or individuals engaged in efforts to overthrow democratically elected governments. Unfortunately it was not made in order.

In an ideal world, we would not specifically stipulate this, but events in Haiti and more recently in Venezuela have led me to wonder whether we need to codify this straightforward, non-partisan position. So I think that we must do all we can not only to support

the spirit of democracy throughout the world, but also to ensure that it is allowed to flourish and to grow.

I would like to ask the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) if she has any thought about how we need to move forward, basically because I believe again, as I said earlier, that such actions fly in the face of our own democratic principles.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. LEE. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I thank the gentlewoman for raising this issue. I want to assure her that I understand and support the general principle she has raised, and I believe that we should be mindful of that issue.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for her comments and her attention to this issue. I look forward to working with her.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the previous speakers said we just do not get it. To him I would say, and to others, yes, we do get it.

I came back to this body after 9/11 precisely because of the attack on Americans and the loss of three people that I knew personally. I came back here with the idea that we needed to fight for America and defend ourselves and not tear up the Constitution in the process.

The suggestion made by some that we are engaged in wide-scale torture, that we are somehow morally equivalent with others is absolutely absurd. The proper way for us to respond to allegations is to do what the Congress is supposed to do, and what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORBERRY) said we are about, which is the proper congressional oversight, not mock hearings like we had last week, not setting up independent commissions, not politicizing this, but doing it in the way the Constitution requires us to do it.

If there is any problem, it is with the Congress not doing proper oversight. We have the commitment from the committees and the subcommittees to do it. Let us rise above partisanship. Let us do the right thing, and let us get rid of this nonsense of a moral equivalency between the United States and some of those terrible regimes around the world. It is not worthy of this body.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this restrictive rule.

The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) offered a reasonable amend-

ment, which was rejected by the Rules Committee, that would have put the House on record in support of a bipartisan, independent investigation into detainee abuse at Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq and the facility at Guantanamo Bay.

Because there are known cases of abuse, and there are more questions than answers about the extent of abuse on people held by or for the United States, we need to shine a very bright light on detainee treatment. Only when we know the full scale of the problem will we be able to stop, prevent, and correct any wrongs that have been done in our country's name.

And if it is true, as Vice President CHENEY says, that the prisoners are peddling lies, then let us investigate prisoner treatment so that we have evidence and not just assertions. The United States should be the standard bearer of democracy, freedom and human rights throughout the world. However, it has been over a year since the story broke about prisoner abuse at Abu Ghraib, and we have yet to conduct a through independent investigation.

Opening the door to an independent investigation would be a major step toward returning our country's standing as a moral leader. And to those who would try to justify what we do by saying, well, it is not as bad as those unspeakable beheadings or other things, well, I should certainly hope not, because we are not like them. We are better than them. We are the United States of America.

And now, those who call on our country to uphold the rule of law and who reject becoming debased ourselves by conducting torture, they become the object of relentless criticism. Those patriots who want to stand up to our values and our belief in the rule of law, we are a proud and a great Nation blessed with immense freedom and with military personnel who proudly defend us. We should not fear the truth; we should demand it with an independent investigation.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman is absolutely right when she says we are better than them. She is absolutely right when she says we are not equal to them. I hope she shares that thought with the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to this debate with interest. And I rise in support of the rule and in support of a realistic foreign policy that some in this Chamber apparently misunderstand.

The actions of September 11, 2001, were not criminal acts; they were acts of war against this Nation.

□ 1400

One of the fundamental problems when you separate all the venom and

vitriol that we have heard in this debate and certainly from someone in the other body who compared American fighting men and women to the Soviets with their gulags and the Third Reich and Pol Pot's regime in Cambodia, one of the fundamental problems seems to be the willingness of many to equate this with some sort of law enforcement problem. It is not.

And to those who are expending such efforts and such rhetoric on behalf of the alleged rights of enemies of this country, let me remind you that the Constitution's first three words are "We the people," not "they the terrorists," or "they the insurgents," or "they the accused."

In wartime the Constitution is a mechanism for the survival of the Republic. And as Mr. Justice Jackson pointed out years ago, the Constitution is not a suicide pact. This need not be a partisan controversy. One look only so far as the History Channel as columnist Thomas Sowell pointed out 2 weeks ago. Do you know what happened at World War II to unfortunate combatants; that is, those without representing a nation state or wearing the uniform or insignia of a military nation or state during World War II?

When those unlawful combatants were apprehended, they were lined up and shot. The Commander in Chief at that time was Franklin Delano Roosevelt. That was in adherence with the Geneva Convention.

We are in a war where people behead Americans. It would be nice to see one-tenth of the passion on behalf of American citizens that we see for the terrorists and their alleged rights. Vote in favor of the rule.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD).

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a second to speak to my friend from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), and he is my friend, but I think he is wrong when he says human rights issues are something that we just do not get.

Well, that is wrong. I think we do get it. I think it is fairly clear to the Members of this body, it is fairly clear to the people of this country, that many of you Democrats are very interested in human rights of the prisoners down in Guantanamo Bay, people who would kill your children, who would kill your families and destroy your homes. And we are interested in getting information in a reasonable manner from prisoners or terrorists in order to save the lives of American people, to save the lives of our military.

So it is a simple matter. It comes down to whose side are you really on?

Are you on the side of the terrorists so you can be against President Bush, or are you on the side of the American people and the American families?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I answer the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), I am on the side of the American people and I am on the side of the rights that I believe are principles inherent in our United States Constitution and throughout the United States Constitution.

I do not have time to yield to the gentleman, otherwise I would.

Make no mistake about it, most of us feel as strongly as most of you do, and I do not think that anybody here ought question our patriotism.

This Nation is the greatest Nation on this Earth, and we do not have to have anything to fear. We do not have to have any worry about trying people who harm this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I will be asking Members to oppose the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will modify this rule so we can consider the amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) that was rejected in the Committee on Rules last night.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of this amendment immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Waxman amendment has been explained. It would establish an independent commission, similar to the 9/11 Commission, to conduct an extensive, bipartisan, and thorough investigation into the multiple accounts of prisoner abuse that have occurred in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Guantanamo.

Mr. Speaker, it has been well over a year since the shocking and humiliating photographs of prisoner abuse at Abu Ghraib first became public. I doubt there is any Member of this Chamber who was not appalled at that disgraceful act. Yet, in spite of these events, the House has done very little of substance.

Mr. Speaker, if you allow me to conclude by saying, a "no" vote will allow Members to vote on the Waxman amendment, so we can take immediate steps to fully investigate these very disturbing incidents of prisoner mistreatment.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a vibrant, robust debate and a good solid beginning of the undeniable debate that will follow on the underlying bill.

In case you missed it from the debate over the rule, there is a lot more to this rule than just Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo. This is an important rule that allows us to consider the intel-

ligence authorization bill that gives our men and women around the world the tools and skill and support they need to win the war against terrorism on our behalf, important new assets in terms of technical capabilities, and a tremendous investment in the most important piece that we have in intelligence, which is those hardworking men and women who were called to public service.

This is a fair rule. It allows for a great deal more consideration of these issues that we have already begun to discuss in terms of detainees and the role of American intelligence in our society and the tools that they need around the world. I encourage everyone to support it and to support the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION ON H. RES. 331—RULE FOR H.R. 2475 INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

"In the resolution strike "and (3)" and insert the following:

"(3) the amendment printed in Section 2 of this resolution if offered by Representative Waxman of California or a designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or demand for division of the question, shall not be subject to amendment, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (4)

SEC. 2. The amendment by Representative Waxman referred to in Section 1 is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2475, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN OF CALIFORNIA

At the end, add the following new title:

TITLE V—ESTABLISHMENT OF INDEPENDENT COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE DETAINEE ABUSES

SEC. 501. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

There is established in the legislative branch the Independent Commission on the Investigation of Detainee Abuses (in this title referred to as the "Commission").

SEC. 502. DUTIES.

(a) INVESTIGATION.—The Commission shall conduct a full and complete investigation of the abuses of detainees in connection with intelligence and intelligence-related activities of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, or any operation within the Global War on Terrorism, including but not limited to the following:

- (1) The extent of the abuses.
- (2) Why the abuses occurred.
- (3) Who is responsible for the abuses.
- (4) Whether any particular Department of Defense, Department of State, Department of Justice, Central Intelligence Agency, National Security Council, or White House policies, procedures, or decisions facilitated the detainee abuses.
- (5) What policies, procedures, or mechanisms failed to prevent the abuses.
- (6) What legislative or executive actions should be taken to prevent such abuses from occurring in the future.
- (7) The extent, if any, to which Guantanamo Detention Center policies influenced policies at the Abu Ghraib prison and other detention centers in and outside Iraq.

(b) ASSESSMENT, ANALYSIS, AND EVALUATION.—During the course of its investigation under subsection (a), the Commission shall assess, analyze, and evaluate relevant per-

sons, policies, procedures, reports, and events, including but not limited to the following:

- (1) The Military Chain of Command.
- (2) The National Security Council.
- (3) The Department of Justice.
- (4) The Department of State.
- (5) The Office of the White House Counsel.
- (6) The Defense Intelligence Agency and the Central Intelligence Agency.
- (7) The approval process for interrogation techniques used at detention facilities in Iraq, Cuba, and Afghanistan.
- (8) The integration of military police and military intelligence operations to coordinate detainee interrogation.
- (9) The roles and actions of private civilian contractors in the abuses and whether they violated the Military Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act or any other United States statutes and international treaties.
- (10) The role of nongovernmental organizations' warnings to United States officials about the abuses.
- (11) The role of Congress and whether it was fully informed throughout the process that uncovered these abuses.
- (12) The extent to which the United States complied with the applicable provisions of the Geneva Conventions of 1949, and the extent to which the United States may have violated international law by restricting the access of the International Committee of the Red Cross to detainees.

SEC. 503. COMPOSITION OF COMMISSION.

(a) MEMBERS.—The Commission shall be composed of 10 members, of whom—

- (1) 1 member shall be appointed by the President, who shall serve as chairman of the Commission;
- (2) 1 member shall be jointly appointed by the minority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the House of Representatives, who shall serve as vice chairman of the Commission;
- (3) 2 members shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate;
- (4) 2 members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;
- (5) 2 members shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate; and
- (6) 2 members shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(b) QUALIFICATIONS; INITIAL MEETING.—

(1) NONGOVERNMENTAL APPOINTEES.—An individual appointed to the Commission may not be an officer or employee of the Federal Government or any State or local government.

(2) OTHER QUALIFICATIONS.—Individuals that shall be appointed to the Commission should be prominent United States citizens, with national recognition and significant depth of experience in such professions as governmental service, law enforcement, the armed services, law, public administration, intelligence gathering, human rights policy, and foreign affairs.

(3) DEADLINE FOR APPOINTMENT.—All members of the Commission shall be appointed within 45 days following the enactment of this Act.

(4) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet and begin the operations of the Commission as soon as practicable. After its initial meeting, the Commission shall meet upon the call of the chairman or a majority of its members.

(c) QUORUM; VACANCIES.—Six members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—Each member appointed to the Commission shall submit a

financial disclosure report pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, notwithstanding the minimum required rate of compensation or time period employed.

SEC. 504. POWERS OF COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) HEARINGS AND EVIDENCE.—The Commission or, on the authority of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out this title—

(A) hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, administer such oaths; and

(B) subject to paragraph (2)(A), require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents,

as the Commission or such designated subcommittee or designated member may determine advisable.

(2) SUBPOENAS.—

(a) ISSUANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A subpoena may be issued under this subsection only—

(I) by the agreement of the chairman and the vice chairman; or

(II) by the affirmative vote of 6 members of the Commission.

(ii) SIGNATURE.—Subject to clause (i), subpoenas issued under this subsection may be issued under the signature of the chairman or any member designated by a majority of the Commission, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman or by a member designated by a majority of the Commission.

(B) ENFORCEMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of contumacy or failure to obey a subpoena issued under this subsection, the United States district court for the judicial district in which the subpoenaed person resides, is served, or may be found, or where the subpoena is returnable, may issue an order requiring such person to appear at any designated place to testify or to produce documentary or other evidence. Any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt of that court.

(ii) ADDITIONAL ENFORCEMENT.—In the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this subsection, the Commission may, by majority vote, certify a statement of fact constituting such failure to the appropriate United States attorney, who may bring the matter before the grand jury for its action, under the same statutory authority and procedures as if the United States attorney had received a certification under sections 102 through 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 192 through 194).

(3) SCOPE.—In carrying out its duties under this Act, the Commission may examine the actions and representations of the current Administration as well as prior Administrations.

(b) CONTRACTING.—The Commission may, to such extent and in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts, enter into contracts to enable the Commission to discharge its duties of this Act.

(c) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the Federal Government, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purposes of this Act. Each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality shall, to the extent author-

ized by law, furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the chairman, the chairman of any subcommittee created by a majority of the Commission, or any member designated by a majority of the Commission.

(2) RECEIPT, HANDLING, STORAGE, AND DISSEMINATION.—Information shall only be received, handled, stored, and disseminated by members of the Commission and its staff consistent with all applicable statutes, regulations, and Executive Orders.

(d) ASSISTANCE FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(1) GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.—The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis administrative support and other services for the performance of the Commission's functions.

(2) OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—In addition to the assistance prescribed in paragraph (1), departments and agencies of the United States may provide to the Commission such services, funds, facilities, staff, and other support services as they may determine advisable and as may be authorized by law.

(e) GIFTS.—The Commission may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

(f) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as departments and agencies of the United States.

SEC. 505. NONAPPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Commission.

(b) PUBLIC MEETINGS AND RELEASE OF PUBLIC VERSIONS OF REPORTS.—The Commission shall—

(1) hold public hearings and meetings to the extent appropriate; and

(2) release public versions of the reports required under section 509.

(c) PUBLIC HEARINGS.—Any public hearings of the Commission shall be conducted in a manner consistent with the protection of information provided to or developed for or by the Commission as required by any applicable statute, regulation, or Executive order.

SEC. 506. STAFF OF COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION.—The chairman, in consultation with vice chairman, in accordance with rules agreed upon by the Commission, may appoint and fix the compensation of a staff director and such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that no rate of pay fixed under this subsection may exceed the equivalent of that payable for a position at level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) PERSONNEL AS FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The staff director and any personnel of the Commission who are employees shall be employees under section 2105 of title 5, United States Code, for purposes of chapters 63, 81, 83, 84, 85, 87, 89, and 90 of that title.

(B) MEMBERS OF COMMISSION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed to apply to members of the Commission.

(b) DETAILEES.—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement from the Commission, and such detailee shall retain the

rights, status, and privileges of his or her regular employment without interruption.

(c) CONSULTANT SERVICES.—The Commission is authorized to procure the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed the daily rate paid a person occupying a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 507. COMPENSATION AND TRAVEL EXPENSES.

(a) COMPENSATION.—Each member of the Commission may be compensated at a rate not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay in effect for a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day during which that member is engaged in the actual performance of the duties of the Commission.

(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 508. SECURITY CLEARANCES FOR COMMISSION MEMBERS AND STAFF.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the appropriate Federal agencies or departments shall cooperate with the Commission in expeditiously providing to the Commission members and staff appropriate security clearances to the extent possible pursuant to existing procedures and requirements.

(b) EXCEPTION.—No person shall be provided with access to classified information under this title without the appropriate required security clearance access.

SEC. 509. REPORTS OF COMMISSION; TERMINATION.

(a) INTERIM REPORTS.—The Commission may submit to Congress and the President interim reports containing such findings, conclusions, and recommendations for corrective measures as have been agreed to by a majority of Commission members.

(b) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to Congress and the President a final report containing such findings, conclusions, and recommendations for corrective measures as have been agreed to by a majority of Commission members.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report prepared under this section shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(d) RECOMMENDATION TO MAKE PUBLIC CERTAIN CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—If the Commission determines that it is in the public interest that some or all of the information contained in a classified annex of a report under this section be made available to the public, the Commission shall make a recommendation to the congressional intelligence committees to make such information public, and the congressional intelligence committees shall consider the recommendation pursuant to the procedures under subsection (e).

(e) PROCEDURE FOR DECLASSIFYING INFORMATION.—

(1) The procedures referred to in subsection (d) are the procedures described in—

(A) with respect to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, clause 11(g) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, One Hundred Ninth Congress; and

(B) with respect to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, section 8 of

Senate Resolution 400, Ninety-Fourth Congress.

(2) In this section, the term “congressional intelligence committees” means—

(A) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

SEC. 510. TERMINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission, and all the authorities of this Act, shall terminate 60 days after the date on which the final report is submitted under section 509(b).

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES BEFORE TERMINATION.—The Commission may use the 60-day period referred to in paragraph (1) for the purpose of concluding its activities, including providing testimony to committees of Congress concerning its reports and disseminating the final report.

SEC. 511. FUNDING.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated funds not to exceed \$5,000,000 for purposes of the activities of the Commission under this Act.

(b) DURATION OF AVAILABILITY.—Amounts made available to the Commission under subsection (a) shall remain available until the termination of the Commission.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 201, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 288]

YEAS—224

Aderholt	Brown-Waite,	Dent
Akin	Ginny	Diaz-Balart, L.
Alexander	Burgess	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bachus	Burton (IN)	Doolittle
Baker	Buyer	Drake
Barrett (SC)	Calvert	Dreier
Bartlett (MD)	Camp	Duncan
Barton (TX)	Cannon	Ehlers
Bass	Cantor	Emerson
Beauprez	Capito	English (PA)
Biggert	Castle	Everett
Bilirakis	Chabot	Feeney
Bishop (UT)	Chocola	Ferguson
Blackburn	Coble	Fitzpatrick (PA)
Blunt	Cole (OK)	Flake
Boehlert	Conaway	Foley
Boehner	Cox	Forbes
Boustany	Crenshaw	Fortenberry
Bradley (NH)	Cubin	Fossella
Brady (TX)	Bonner	Fox
Brown (SC)	Bono	Cunningham
	Boozman	Davis (KY)
	Boustany	Davis, Jo Ann
	Bradley (NH)	Davis, Tom
	Brady (TX)	Deal (GA)
	Brown (SC)	DeLay

Gilchrest	Lewis (KY)	Reichert
Gillmor	Linder	Renzi
Gingrey	LoBiondo	Reynolds
Gohmert	Lucas	Rogers (AL)
Goode	Lungren, Daniel	Rogers (KY)
Goodlatte	E.	Rogers (MI)
Granger	Mack	Rohrabacher
Graves	Manzullo	Ros-Lehtinen
Green (WI)	Marchant	Royce
Gutknecht	McCaul (TX)	Ryan (WI)
Hall	McCotter	Ryun (KS)
Harris	McCrery	Saxton
Hart	McHenry	Schwarz (MI)
Hastings (WA)	McHugh	Sensenbrenner
Hayes	McKeon	Shadegg
Hayworth	McMorris	Shaw
Hefley	Mica	Shays
Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Sherwood
Hergert	Miller (MI)	Shimkus
Hobson	Miller, Gary	Shuster
Hoekstra	Moran (KS)	Simmons
Hostettler	Musgrave	Simpson
Hulshof	Myrick	Smith (NJ)
Hunter	Neugebauer	Smith (TX)
Hyde	Ney	Sodrel
Inglis (SC)	Northup	Souder
Issa	Norwood	Stearns
Istook	Nunes	Sullivan
Jenkins	Nussle	Sweeney
Jindal	Osborne	Tancredo
Johnson (CT)	Otter	Taylor (NC)
Johnson (IL)	Oxley	Terry
Johnson, Sam	Paul	Thomas
Jones (NC)	Pearce	Thornberry
Keller	Pence	Tiahrt
Kelly	Peterson (PA)	Tiberi
Kennedy (MN)	Petri	Turner
King (IA)	Pickering	Upton
King (NY)	Pitts	Walsh
Kingston	Platts	Wamp
Kirk	Poe	Weldon (FL)
Kline	Pombo	Weldon (PA)
Knollenberg	Porter	Weller
Kolbe	Price (GA)	Westmoreland
Kuhl (NY)	Pryce (OH)	Wick
LaHood	Putnam	Wilson (NM)
Latham	Radanovich	Wilson (SC)
LaTourette	Ramstad	Wolf
Leach	Regula	Young (AK)
Lewis (CA)	Rehberg	

NAYS—201

Abercrombie	Davis (TN)	Kildee
Ackerman	DeFazio	Kilpatrick (MI)
Allen	DeGette	Kind
Andrews	Delahunt	Kucinich
Baca	DeLauro	Langevin
Baird	Dicks	Lantos
Baldwin	Dingell	Larsen (WA)
Barrow	Doggett	Larson (CT)
Bean	Doyle	Lee
Becerra	Edwards	Levin
Berkley	Emanuel	Lipinski
Berman	Engel	Lofgren, Zoe
Berry	Eshoo	Lowey
Bishop (GA)	Etheridge	Lynch
Bishop (NY)	Evans	Maloney
Blumenauer	Farr	Markey
Boren	Fattah	Marshall
Boswell	Filner	Matheson
Boucher	Ford	Matsui
Boyd	Frank (MA)	McCarthy
Brady (PA)	Gonzalez	McCollum (MN)
Brown (OH)	Gordon	McDermott
Brown, Corrine	Green, Al	McGovern
Butterfield	Green, Gene	McIntyre
Capps	Grijalva	McKinney
Capuano	Gutierrez	McNulty
Cardin	Harman	Meehan
Cardoza	Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)
Carnahan	Higgins	Meeks (NY)
Carson	Hinchey	Melancon
Case	Hinojosa	Menendez
Chandler	Holden	Michaud
Clay	Holt	Millender-
Cleaver	Honda	McDonald
Clyburn	Hooley	Miller (NC)
Conyers	Hoyer	Miller, George
Cooper	Inslee	Mollohan
Costa	Israel	Moore (KS)
Costello	Jackson (IL)	Moore (WI)
Cramer	Jackson-Lee	Moran (VA)
Crowley	(TX)	Murtha
Cuellar	Jefferson	Nadler
Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano
Davis (AL)	Jones (OH)	Neal (MA)
Davis (CA)	Kanjorski	Oberstar
Davis (FL)	Kaptur	Obey
Davis (IL)	Kennedy (RI)	Olver

Ortiz	Sánchez, Linda	Taylor (MS)
Owens	T.	Thompson (CA)
Pallone	Sanchez, Loretta	Thompson (MS)
Pascarell	Sanders	Tierney
Pastor	Schakowsky	Towns
Payne	Schiff	Udall (CO)
Pelosi	Schwartz (PA)	Udall (NM)
Peterson (MN)	Scott (GA)	Van Hollen
Pomeroy	Scott (VA)	Velázquez
Price (NC)	Serrano	Visclosky
Rahall	Sherman	Wasserman
Rangel	Skelton	Schultz
Reyes	Slaughter	Waters
Ross	Smith (WA)	Watson
Rothman	Snyder	Watt
Roybal-Allard	Solis	Waxman
Ruppersberger	Spratt	Weiner
Rush	Stark	Wexler
Ryan (OH)	Strickland	Woolsey
Sabo	Stupak	Wu
Salazar	Tanner	Wynn
	Tauscher	

NOT VOTING—8

Carter	Murphy	Whitfield
Hereth	Sessions	Young (FL)
Lewis (GA)	Walden (OR)	

□ 1431

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GILLMOR and Mr. ISTOOK changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEMBERS TO ATTEND FUNERAL OF THE HON. “JAKE” PICKLE

(Mr. THOMAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and I are in the process of putting together the potential list for flying to the Jake Pickle funeral tomorrow at 4 p.m. It is very short notice, and it will be an imposition on the funeral site. We are in contact now.

What we need to know are how many Members, beyond the Texas delegation and the Committee on Ways and Means, have a very strong interest in attending the Jake Pickle funeral? We would leave with ample time to get there prior to the 4 p.m. funeral time, and then we would immediately return. Any Member who has an interest, would they call the Committee on Ways and Means and ask for Allison Giles, 53630. We need to pull together an approximate number of Members who have a strong interest in attending the Jake Pickle funeral.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 331, I call up the bill (H.R. 2475) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government,

the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 331, the bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 2475 is as follows:

H. R. 2475

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006".

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2006 for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the following elements of the United States Government:

- (1) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.
- (2) The Central Intelligence Agency.
- (3) The Department of Defense.
- (4) The Defense Intelligence Agency.
- (5) The National Security Agency.
- (6) The Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.
- (7) The Department of State.
- (8) The Department of the Treasury.
- (9) The Department of Energy.
- (10) The Department of Justice.
- (11) The Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- (12) The National Reconnaissance Office.
- (13) The National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.
- (14) The Coast Guard.
- (15) The Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 102. CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) SPECIFICATIONS OF AMOUNTS AND PERSONNEL CEILINGS.—The amounts authorized to be appropriated under section 101, and the authorized personnel ceilings as of September 30, 2006, for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the elements listed in such section, are those specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations prepared to accompany the bill H.R. _____ of the One Hundred Ninth Congress.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.—The Schedule of Authorizations shall be made available to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives and to the President. The President shall provide for suitable distribution of the Schedule, or of appropriate portions of the Schedule, within the executive branch.

SEC. 103. PERSONNEL CEILING ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) AUTHORITY FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—With the approval of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Director of National Intelligence may authorize employment of civilian personnel in excess of the number authorized for fiscal year 2006 under section 102 when the Director of National Intelligence determines that such action is necessary to the performance of important intelligence functions.

(b) NOTICE TO INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.—The Director of National Intelligence shall notify promptly the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives whenever the Director exercises the authority granted by this section.

SEC. 104. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of National Intelligence for fiscal year 2006 the sum of \$ _____. Within such amount, funds identified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a) for advanced research and development shall remain available until September 30, 2007.

(b) AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL LEVELS.—The elements within the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of National Intelligence are authorized _____ full-time personnel as of September 30, 2006. Personnel serving in such elements may be permanent employees of the Intelligence Community Management Account or personnel detailed from other elements of the United States Government.

(c) CLASSIFIED AUTHORIZATIONS.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account by subsection (a), there are also authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account for fiscal year 2006 such additional amounts as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a). Such additional amounts for advanced research and development shall remain available until September 30, 2007.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF PERSONNEL.—In addition to the personnel authorized by subsection (b) for elements of the Intelligence Community Management Account as of September 30, 2006, there are also authorized such additional personnel for such elements as of that date as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations.

(d) REIMBURSEMENT.—Except as provided in section 113 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404h), during fiscal year 2006 any officer or employee of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces who is detailed to the staff of the Intelligence Community Management Account from another element of the United States Government shall be detailed on a reimbursable basis, except that any such officer, employee, or member may be detailed on a nonreimbursable basis for a period of less than one year for the performance of temporary functions as required by the Director of National Intelligence.

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund for fiscal year 2006 the sum of \$ _____.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. INCREASE IN EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS AUTHORIZED BY LAW.

Appropriations authorized by this Act for salary, pay, retirement, and other benefits for Federal employees may be increased by such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in such compensation or benefits authorized by law.

SEC. 302. RESTRICTION ON CONDUCT OF INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

The authorization of appropriations by this Act shall not be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity which is not otherwise authorized by the Constitution or the laws of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The committee amendment in the nature of

a substitute printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in Part A of House Report 109-141, is adopted.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, is as follows:

H. R. 2475

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

Sec. 101. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 102. Classified Schedule of Authorizations.

Sec. 103. Personnel ceiling adjustments.

Sec. 104. Intelligence Community Management Account.

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

Sec. 201. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Increase in employee compensation and benefits authorized by law.

Sec. 302. Restriction on conduct of intelligence activities.

Sec. 303. Authority of the Director of National Intelligence to assign individuals to United States missions in foreign countries to coordinate and direct intelligence and intelligence-related activities conducted in that country.

Sec. 304. Clarification of delegation of transfer or reprogramming authority.

Sec. 305. Approval of personnel transfer for new national intelligence centers.

Sec. 306. Additional duties for the Director of Science and Technology.

Sec. 307. Comprehensive inventory of special access programs.

Sec. 308. Sense of Congress on budget execution authority procedures.

Sec. 309. Sense of Congress with respect to multi-level security clearances.

TITLE IV—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Sec. 401. Clarification of role of the Director of Central Intelligence Agency as head of human intelligence collection.

TITLE I—INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2006 for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the following elements of the United States Government:

- (1) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.
- (2) The Central Intelligence Agency.
- (3) The Department of Defense.
- (4) The Defense Intelligence Agency.
- (5) The National Security Agency.
- (6) The Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.
- (7) The Department of State.
- (8) The Department of the Treasury.
- (9) The Department of Energy.
- (10) The Department of Justice.
- (11) The Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- (12) The National Reconnaissance Office.
- (13) The National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency.
- (14) The Coast Guard.
- (15) The Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 102. CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) SPECIFICATIONS OF AMOUNTS AND PERSONNEL CEILINGS.—The amounts authorized to

be appropriated under section 101, and the authorized personnel ceilings as of September 30, 2006, for the conduct of the intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the elements listed in such section, are those specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations prepared to accompany the bill H.R. 2475 of the One Hundred Ninth Congress.

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF CLASSIFIED SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS.**—The Schedule of Authorizations shall be made available to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives and to the President. The President shall provide for suitable distribution of the Schedule, or of appropriate portions of the Schedule, within the executive branch.

SEC. 103. PERSONNEL CEILING ADJUSTMENTS.

(a) **AUTHORITY FOR ADJUSTMENTS.**—With the approval of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Director of National Intelligence may authorize employment of civilian personnel in excess of the number authorized for fiscal year 2006 under section 102 when the Director of National Intelligence determines that such action is necessary to the performance of important intelligence functions.

(b) **NOTICE TO INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEES.**—The Director of National Intelligence shall notify promptly the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives whenever the Director exercises the authority granted by this section.

SEC. 104. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of National Intelligence for fiscal year 2006 the sum of \$446,144,000. Within such amount, funds identified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a) for advanced research and development shall remain available until September 30, 2007.

(b) **AUTHORIZED PERSONNEL LEVELS.**—The elements within the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of National Intelligence are authorized 817 full-time personnel as of September 30, 2006. Personnel serving in such elements may be permanent employees of the Intelligence Community Management Account or personnel detailed from other elements of the United States Government.

(c) **CLASSIFIED AUTHORIZATIONS.**—

(1) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—In addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account by subsection (a), there are also authorized to be appropriated for the Intelligence Community Management Account for fiscal year 2006 such additional amounts as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations referred to in section 102(a). Such additional amounts for advanced research and development shall remain available until September 30, 2007.

(2) **AUTHORIZATION OF PERSONNEL.**—In addition to the personnel authorized by subsection (b) for elements of the Intelligence Community Management Account as of September 30, 2006, there are also authorized such additional personnel for such elements as of that date as are specified in the classified Schedule of Authorizations.

(d) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—Except as provided in section 113 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404h), during fiscal year 2006 any officer or employee of the United States or a member of the Armed Forces who is detailed to the staff of the Intelligence Community Management Account from another element of the United States Government shall be detailed on a reimbursable basis, except that any such officer, employee, or member may be detailed on a non-reimbursable basis for a period of less than one year for the performance of temporary functions as required by the Director of National Intelligence.

TITLE II—CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

SEC. 201. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability Fund for fiscal year 2006 the sum of \$244,600,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. INCREASE IN EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS AUTHORIZED BY LAW.

Appropriations authorized by this Act for salary, pay, retirement, and other benefits for Federal employees may be increased by such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in such compensation or benefits authorized by law.

SEC. 302. RESTRICTION ON CONDUCT OF INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.

The authorization of appropriations by this Act shall not be deemed to constitute authority for the conduct of any intelligence activity which is not otherwise authorized by the Constitution or the laws of the United States.

SEC. 304. CLARIFICATION OF DELEGATION OF TRANSFER OR REPROGRAMMING AUTHORITY.

Paragraph (5)(B) of section 102A(d) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403–1(d)), as added by section 1011(a) of the National Security Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 (title I of Public Law 108–458; 118 Stat. 3643), is amended by striking “or agency involved” in the second sentence and inserting “involved or the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency (in the case of the Central Intelligence Agency)”.

SEC. 306. ADDITIONAL DUTIES FOR THE DIRECTOR OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.

(a) **COORDINATION AND PRIORITIZATION OF RESEARCH CONDUCTED BY ELEMENTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.**—Subsection (d) of section 103E of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403–3e), as added by section 1011(a) of the National Security Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 (title I of Public Law 108–458; 118 Stat. 3643), is amended—

(1) by inserting “and prioritize” after “coordinate” in paragraph (3)(A); and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) In carrying out paragraph (3)(A), the Committee shall identify basic, advanced, and applied research programs to be carried out by elements of the intelligence community.”.

(b) **DEVELOPMENT OF TECHNOLOGY GOALS.**—Section 103E of such Act (50 U.S.C. 403–3e), as so added, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (4);

(B) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (6); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

“(5) assist the Director in establishing goals for the elements of the intelligence community to meet the technology needs of the community; and”;

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) **GOALS FOR TECHNOLOGY NEEDS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.**—In carrying out subsection (c)(5), the Director of Science and Technology shall—

“(1) perform systematic identification and assessment of the most significant intelligence challenges that require technical solutions; and

“(2) examine options to enhance the responsiveness of research and design programs to meet the requirements of the intelligence community for timely support.”.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than June 30, 2006, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to Congress a report containing a strategy for the development and use of technology in the intelligence community through 2021. Such report

may be submitted in classified form and shall include—

(1) an assessment of the highest priority intelligence gaps across the intelligence community that may be resolved by the use of technology;

(2) goals for advanced research and development and a strategy to achieve such goals;

(3) an explanation of how each advanced research and development project funded under the National Intelligence Program addresses an identified intelligence gap;

(4) a list of all current and projected research and development projects by research type (basic, advanced, or applied) with estimated funding levels, estimated initiation dates, and estimated completion dates; and

(5) a plan to incorporate technology from research and development projects into National Intelligence Program acquisition programs.

SEC. 307. COMPREHENSIVE INVENTORY OF SPECIAL ACCESS PROGRAMS.

Not later than January 15, 2006, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees (as defined in section 3(7) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(7))) a classified report providing a comprehensive inventory of all special access programs under the National Intelligence Program (as defined in section 3(6) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 401a(6))).

SEC. 308. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON BUDGET EXECUTION AUTHORITY PROCEDURES.

It is the sense of Congress that the Director of National Intelligence should expeditiously establish the necessary budgetary processes and procedures with the heads of the departments containing agencies or organizations within the intelligence community, and the heads of such agencies and organizations, in order to—

(1) implement the budget execution authorities provided under, and submit the reports to Congress required by, subsection (c) of section 102A of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 403–1), as amended by section 1011(a) of the National Security Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 (title I of Public Law 108–458; 118 Stat. 3643); and

(2) carry out the duties and authorities of the Director of National Intelligence with respect to the transfer and reprogramming of funds under the National Intelligence Program under subsection (d) of such section, as so amended.

SEC. 309. SENSE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO MULTI-LEVEL SECURITY CLEARANCES.

It is the sense of Congress that the Director of National Intelligence should promptly establish and oversee the implementation of a multi-level security clearance system across the intelligence community to leverage the cultural and linguistic skills of subject matter experts and individuals proficient in foreign languages critical to national security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in the report, if offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), or her designee, which shall be considered read, and shall be debatable for 30 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) each will control 30 minutes of debate on the bill.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2475, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006. This is a very good bill, a bill we can be very

proud of, and a bill that every Member of the House can and should support.

Before I talk about some of the details in the bill, I would like to recognize the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN). We have worked hard on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence to keep this committee focused on the job that needs to be done and to do so on a bipartisan basis, and I thank the gentlewoman for working with us in that process and being able to maintain that spirit as we bring this bill to the floor on a bipartisan basis. I also thank her staff and our staff for helping us through this process in bringing this bill here today.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago when he was chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Porter Goss, now director of the Central Intelligence Agency, asked me to take a strategic look at the technical capabilities within the United States intelligence community. He wanted me to see how the technical intelligence collection systems all work together, evaluate their individual contributions to national security, and see if there were redundancies to understand the affordability of the many systems and, most importantly, understand the impacts on the rest of the intelligence community.

What Mr. Goss really asked us to do was to go back, and we have expanded that in the committee over the past 8 or 9 months, to take a look at the strategic framework that we face in the world today and how we should respond to the threats. So we spent a considerable amount of time looking at the threats that America faces: What is the threat environment that is out there today; what do we expect it to be in 3, 5 and 7 years, so we can shape the proper intelligence community to give our policymakers and our military the right information to make good decisions and keep our soldiers safe?

We have then taken that to take a look at the feedback we have gotten from the 9/11 Commission, the feedback we have gotten from the WMD Commission as to the particular strengths within the intelligence community and also some of the particular weaknesses.

So as we put this bill together, we really focused on making sure that we had a good balance between our human capabilities, the investment we were making in our human capabilities for the long term, and the investment we were making in our technical capabilities. This bill does that by investing more in our human capabilities.

On the technical capabilities, it takes a very, very hard look at the different programs that we have in place there. It makes sure that what we do is put in place programs that will complement each other, give us the information that we need, and hopefully put us on a framework and on a pathway to balancing human capabilities with our technical capabilities.

Also in that area, this bill moves forward and holds some of our contractors

accountable for their performance. This is an area where tactically we may disagree on some of the points on how to make that happen, but we are very much in sync on a bipartisan basis that we need a strategic plan and we need to have our contractors perform. It will also lay the framework for a discussion we will have throughout this year about how to make sure that in a time where we have limited budgets and limited programs underway, that we maintain the industrial base here in the United States.

So there are a lot of things that we do in this bill to make sure that we have got the balance and are moving in the right direction on our technical capabilities.

Another key element of this bill is we have heard consistently from our field personnel and others within the intelligence community, especially those involved in the counterterrorism effort, that we cannot fund counterterrorism on an ad hoc basis. So what we did in this bill is we have authorized the majority of the dollars that we believe will be needed to build our intelligence capability and to fund the war on terrorism.

We think it is important to send to the intelligence community a clear signal of how much money they are going to have so they can do the appropriate planning and the ramping up of resources in the waging of this global war on terrorism.

As I said at the beginning of my statement, we have done this on a bipartisan basis. We have taken a strategic look at what the intelligence community, where it needs to be and where it needs to go. We are going to continue working in that effort. I think as Members see through the debate, we have made a lot of progress and there is more work to do.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2475, the strongest intelligence authorization bill to emerge from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in recent memory. Without the funding authorized in this bill, the brave men and women of the intelligence community would not be able to do their jobs which are so vital to the defense of our country. I and many other members of the committee have visited these intelligence professionals in some of the most austere places of the world, and they deserve our gratitude and support.

I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and thank him and all of the members and staff of our hardworking committee for their bipartisanship and patriotism. As one of our members, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER) often says, we put America first.

Our members have made a difference. In April 2004, all nine Democrats on the Intelligence Committee introduced leg-

islation that became the basis for the 9/11 Commission's Report and the intelligence reform legislation passed by Congress last fall. That reform dramatically reshaped our intelligence community, unifying 15 agencies under the leadership of a director of National Intelligence.

This year's intelligence authorization bill authorizes funds for that new office. The DNI must succeed in his job and he deserves our support. He is responsible for ensuring that intelligence is timely, accurate and actionable. To do this, he needs authority to build and execute budgets and move personnel. So I am pleased that we removed a provision in this bill that would have severely eroded the DNI's authority to move personnel around the intelligence community.

Mr. Speaker, in the fight against terrorists, intelligence is the tip of the spear. Some see this fight as a traditional war, requiring wartime emergency budgets and wartime authorities for the President. That may have been the right approach immediately after 9/11. We fought a war in Afghanistan and achieved an impressive victory.

But the terrorist threat has changed. Today we no longer face a centralized top-down terrorist organization operating out of one country. We face a network of loosely affiliated terrorist groups which operate as franchises around the world, and that is why I believe we are living in an era of terror.

This legislation does some good things to help us achieve victory in an era of terror.

First, it ends our reliance on emergency supplemental budgets for counterterrorism. The budget the President sent to Congress this year funded less than 40 percent of the intelligence community counterterrorism requirements, leaving the rest for emergency supplementals. This bill changes that on a bipartisan basis, and we fund 100 percent of CT requirements.

Second, this legislation incorporates a resolution introduced by all nine Democrats, urging the new DNI to establish a multi-tiered security clearance system to allow patriotic Americans with relatives in foreign countries to obtain security clearances and serve our Nation. It is high time we do this. This will help with field officers who can speak the languages and blend in with terrorist groups, penetrate proliferation networks, and recruit spies against the toughest targets.

□ 1445

Victory in an era of terror will not be achieved by military might alone, Mr. Speaker. Victory will require America to win the argument for the hearts and minds of the next generation in the Arab and Muslim world. I fear that we are presently losing that argument.

The ongoing revelations about abuses at Guantanamo Bay and elsewhere undermine our ability to maintain the moral high ground and be seen as a beacon of democracy and human

rights. I am encouraged that our committee's new oversight subcommittee is investigating abuses that have occurred in our interrogation and detention programs within the intelligence community. This is a serious bipartisan investigation. But I also support a broader public bipartisan inquiry into detention policies across the government so that our efforts to fight the terrorists do not become a moral black eye for America that undermines our security.

One area where this legislation can be improved, Mr. Speaker, is in its approach to technical systems. The details of these systems are classified and cannot be discussed openly. But I am concerned that we have made sudden, drastic cuts to certain programs that may lead to a gap in our intelligence capabilities and erode the industrial base needed to develop critical capabilities in the future. I am pleased that the chairman is committed to addressing this problem with me as the bill moves to conference.

Overall, Mr. Speaker, this is strong legislation that puts us on the right track to achieve victory in an era of terror. There is more, much more, we must do and we will. The brave men and women of the intelligence community deserve nothing less.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI), a member of the committee.

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2475. As a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence from Arizona, securing our borders has become one of our top priorities. Intelligence and border security go hand in hand as America strengthens and secures its borders, particularly in the Southwest. This bill funds activities necessary to keep America safe and, under the gentleman from Michigan's leadership, for the first time this bill helps to provide our Nation with actionable intelligence when it comes to border security.

This legislation addresses the critical need for enhanced counternarcotics and counterterrorism collection and analysis throughout Mexico and Central and South America. It provides full funding to the director of National Intelligence to develop and implement a comprehensive intelligence collection strategy to help stem the illegal flow of drugs, contraband and special interest aliens. In addition, this bill authorizes the necessary funds to provide the intelligence community the resources required to fulfill the intelligence operations in Iraq and other pressing intelligence missions around the globe. The bill increases the funding over last year that provides additional personnel billets for linguists, analysts and human collection, invests in new facilities and training opportunities, and develops innovative technical tools.

In line with the President's priorities, this legislation significantly en-

hances our global human intelligence collection capabilities. Human intelligence requires boots on the ground across the globe and those boots need linguistic skills, in-depth cultural and tradecraft training, technical tools and a dedicated support staff to be successful. H.R. 2475 provides both the people and the infrastructure to expand and improve U.S. human intelligence collection in regions around the world.

Experts estimate that almost 100 foreign entities, including both state and nonstate actors, actively engage in espionage against the United States. H.R. 2475 significantly reduces these threats and improves our counterintelligence activities. Intelligence is our first line of defense. Actionable intelligence saves lives and determines battlefield victory. I ask my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill and help reduce the threat and make America more secure.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL) who is ranking member of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence, a mouthful that we call HACI. (Mr. BOSWELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I do rise in support of H.R. 2475. It may not be a perfect bill, but there are many, many good things in it. I am very pleased that the bill before us today no longer includes a provision that would have undermined the authorities of Ambassador Negroponte, the newly appointed director of National Intelligence. My colleagues and I put a lot of effort into passing an intelligence reform bill last year as was just discussed. We worked hard on giving the director of National Intelligence all the authorities he needed to make the intelligence community function as a community, including the authority to transfer people to new intelligence centers if and as needed. To tie Ambassador Negroponte's hands before his organization has been stood up, it did not seem like a smart thing to do. I would not have supported this bill had the provision limiting the DNI's personnel transfer authorities not been taken out of the bill.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the gentleman from California (Ms. HARMAN) for their efforts to remove this provision and I thank 9/11 Commission chairmen, Governor Tom Kean and Congressman Lee Hamilton, for clearly stating their opposition to it. I look forward to us addressing the other recommendations by the Commission. It is also my belief that the DNI has to control the money to be able to fulfill his charge of responsibility.

I am pleased that this year's authorization bill also fixes the number one issue my colleagues and I raised last year, full funding for counterterrorism operations. H.R. 2475 authorizes full

funding for the intelligence community's counterterrorism operations this year. That should remove impediments to the intelligence community's ability to plan their operations. Maybe this will be the year we are able to hunt down Osama bin Laden. I certainly hope so, and I know we all feel that way. The world will be better off once he is taken care of.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Michigan and the gentlewoman from California for leading the Intelligence Committee in a bipartisan fashion. National security must be a bipartisan issue and that is the direction the committee is returning to.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing forward this bill and I want to thank the ranking member as well for making this a bipartisan bill and working together. I think a lot of credit also goes to our very capable staff who have worked very hard and very professionally to pull together a very good piece of work.

The technical and tactical subcommittee has been very active over the last 5 months looking at our intelligence systems as they relate to the military and also the high-cost technical collection programs that our Nation relies on. The members of that committee have given their personal time and traveled in many instances across the country, and I wanted to thank the members of the subcommittee and particularly the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) for working very hard in this area. We have tried to understand what works, what is not working, do a detailed review of some of these very expensive programs, looking at what complements each other, where the gaps are, where the overlaps are, so that we can improve our intelligence capability and make sure that we are using every dollar wisely.

This bill makes several very important changes in direction in our intelligence community. We have found that research and development is underfunded pretty much across the entire intelligence community and it is poorly coordinated, both in pathfinding research and in incremental research in our current capabilities.

There are several large programs that are significantly off track which causes a draining of funds away from other intelligence priorities. We will not give contractors blank checks to cover cost, schedule, and performance problems that they have failed to manage. We have to control this budget because cost overruns compromise other intelligence programs and put us as Members of Congress in the difficult position of managing different risks.

This bill strengthens human intelligence. It strengthens our analytical

capability. It strengthens translation and language capability. And we insist that systems have to include plans to task sensors, exploit the bits and bytes that come out of sensors, and disseminate information to people who need it. If you do not have that, what you really have is a science experiment, not an intelligence capability. In short, we have come forward with an integrated strategic approach to the purchase of high-cost technologies.

We have much work yet to do to win the war on terrorism. When we win it, it will be because of two things: the bravery of our soldiers and the superiority of American intelligence. I thank the gentleman for bringing this bill forward. I look forward to voting for it.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, the new news on our committee is that we have stood up an oversight subcommittee. Much discussion has been made about this already today.

It is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER) who is ranking member of the intelligence oversight subcommittee.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, I thank the chairman, I thank the staff of both sides of the aisle. I stand in enthusiastic and strong support of H.R. 2475. This bill addresses several issues of great concern to the members of the committee and, in fact, to all Americans. These issues were first raised or detailed by several blue ribbon commissions that reviewed the performance of the intelligence community after 9/11 and by the Congress in the intelligence reform bill that was passed last year.

This bill invests in an analytical initiative that draws on expertise resident at three centers: the Missile and Space Intelligence Center in Huntsville, Alabama; the National Air and Space Intelligence Center in Dayton, Ohio; and at the National Ground Intelligence Center in Charlottesville, Virginia. These centers will collaboratively assess the vulnerabilities of aircraft to foreign missiles and other airborne threats and will develop countermeasures to protect commercial aircraft at home and protect military aircraft for our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. The bill provides for much needed upgrades to information networks in these centers, allowing them to eliminate possible information gaps and to integrate stovepiped information. As recommended by the WMD Commission, this will ensure that analysts and operators have the information they need when they need it.

Last year's intelligence legislation significantly reformed the intelligence community. Real reform, however, requires accountability and oversight. I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member. This year, we have set up, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) is here and I assume is going to speak in a few minutes as well, this oversight subcommittee. This oversight subcommittee has been working just as it should work. I am

encouraged by our efforts to date to provide meaningful congressional oversight of the entire intelligence community. We have initiated in-depth reviews of intelligence community interrogation and detention operations, and we are actively pursuing answers to tough questions. We are also monitoring the standup of the new DNI, ensuring that the intelligence community implements the changes specified in the legislation.

Again, I thank the chairman, I thank the ranking member. We are off to a fine start and this is an excellent bill. The Members should support it.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight who has been working very effectively with the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER) to do the work that an oversight subcommittee is expected to do.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of this bill. I also rise in appreciation for the work that the chairman and the ranking member have done in this bill and in fulfilling Congress' role vis-a-vis the intelligence agencies in general. Further, I appreciate my partner on the oversight subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER), and all that he means to this joint effort.

Mr. Speaker, the members of this committee are serious, hardworking, knowledgeable, committed members. So much of what we do on the Intelligence Committee is done behind closed doors. That can be an advantage and a disadvantage. It is an advantage, in a sense, not to do work in front of the television cameras and without press releases and without all the partisanship that sometimes attends some of what we do in Congress. It can be a disadvantage because we cannot talk with our constituents or even many of our colleagues about what we do. The only reason to be on this committee is to contribute to the national security of the country, and I believe that all members on both sides of the aisle in fact do that.

At the beginning of this Congress, the chairman and the ranking member decided to create an oversight subcommittee. It became clear from the report of the 9/11 Commission, from the Rob Silverman Commission on Weapons of Mass Destruction, in fact, a host of other studies and reports, some even before the attacks of September 11, 2001, that Congress has to do its job.

□ 1500

It is not enough just to say that the executive branch needs to change the way it does its work in the post-Cold War world. We have to do our job as well, and we should expect more of ourselves.

One of the things we have done differently is to create this oversight subcommittee to, as I mentioned a few

moments ago, have greater depth but also greater persistence in our oversight of key intelligence issues. The rules of the full Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence give us our mandate this year, which include oversight of the intelligence reform bill that Congress passed last fall. It gives specific emphasis on items for oversight that include community-wide information-sharing, leaks of classified information, analysis and information-assuring technologies, as well as audits and investigation and tracking congressionally directed actions.

That is our mandate and it is a full plate, but members on both sides of the aisle are going about that agenda working in not just a bipartisan but really nonpartisan way.

And, in addition, I think Members on both sides agree with the Robb-Silberman panel when they suggest that we should have these oversight subcommittees, but we should not just hop around following newspaper articles and doing our efforts, that we ought to have strategic oversight. In fact, they say on page 338 of their commission report: "We suggest that . . . the oversight committees limit their activities to 'strategic oversight,' meaning they would set an agenda at the start of the year or session of Congress, based on top priorities, such as information sharing, and stick to that agenda."

That is exactly what the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER) and I are attempting to do: to be tough but fair, to not be apologists for the administration but not to be bashers of the administration, to try to pursue the national security interests of the country as it relates to intelligence oversight. That is the way serious oversight is done, and I look forward to continuing to work from that perspective.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, my home State of California produces many of the platforms and systems that give us the technical edge in intelligence, and I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO), my California friend, ranking member of the Technical and Tactical Intelligence Subcommittee of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, first I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), our distinguished ranking member, for her exceptional leadership on the committee; certainly to the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman Hoekstra) for the tone that he has brought to the committee. I think it is much improved, and I think it is a result of the bipartisan ship that we have enjoyed since the chairman has arrived that we see it in this piece of legislation which I am proud to support.

I am especially pleased to see the multilevel security clearance legislation introduced in March by committee Democrats, my colleagues that I am so

proud of, that is in this bill. This provision will help the intelligence community leverage the cultural and linguistic skills of a broader candidate pool, which is so important to our intelligence community.

During the markup of this bill, I offered an amendment requiring inspectors general at the Defense and State Departments, the CIA, and the DNI inspector general to establish telephone hotlines for intelligence professionals to report complaints if they believe policymakers are attempting to unduly or improperly influence them. I think that it is an important effort because there is a question mark in the mind of the American people on this very subject.

As a result, the chairman agreed to include language in this bill about the need to ensure ombudsmen in these agencies to fulfill their role to protect analysts and other professionals within the intelligence community. The committee made a commitment to perform effective oversight in this matter; so I withdraw my amendment, and I thank the chairman for that effort.

As the ranking member of the Technical and Tactical Intelligence Subcommittee, I am concerned that this bill reduces or eliminates funding for several key programs in the administration's request without full justification. Missing is an in-depth consideration of the effect that funding reductions will have on the overall intelligence architecture, the viability of our industrial base, which is essential. Once that disassembles, we cannot put Humpty Dumpty back together again, as well as overarching national security requirements. I hope the DNI and the Secretary of Defense will conduct a comprehensive review and explain the strategic linkages between collection requirements, capabilities, and developing programs. This review would better support future funding deliberations and decisions by the committee. It is very important that that be done.

In closing, I want to express one of my deep concerns, and I know that it is the concern that many of my colleagues share, and that is the continuing reports of torture and other abuses of detainees. From Abu Ghraib to Guantanamo Bay, the mounting revelations have become more than an embarrassment to our country. They are a liability to our deployed servicemembers. If, in fact, the Congress and its committees of jurisdiction fail to fully investigate, I support a special commission to do so. We have to have a full accounting for the American people and have the determination to seek that.

So, in closing, I want to thank my colleagues, the chairman, certainly our ranking member, all of my colleagues on the committee, and most especially a superb and dedicated staff. I salute them. I respect them for the work that they have done certainly on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from

New York (Mr. MCHUGH), a new member of the committee, a very valuable member, and also a member of the House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MCHUGH. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation, H.R. 2475. As the distinguished chairman so graciously recognized, I am one of the newer members of this committee; and I must say in that respect, I am enormously impressed by the bipartisan attitude that all the members bring to this very important issue, that of national security and its interface with our intelligence communities. That is a tribute to all of the members, Democrat and Republican alike, but I think it is a particular tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Chairman HOEKSTRA) and also the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), ranking member, who have worked so well together and provided that leadership of bipartisanship.

The chairman noted, Madam Speaker, that I am a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, and in that capacity I have the honor of serving as chairman of the Military Personnel Subcommittee; and as such, I have been particularly interested in programs that aid the warfighter, those brave men and women who are putting their lives on the line each and every day for our freedoms and for our interests. And I am pleased to report that this legislation contains very important increases in funding for military intelligence programs.

In particular, H.R. 2475 includes significant increases in funding for operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, for the global war on terrorism, and thereby decreases the reliance on supplemental budgeting. Budgeting by supplemental, at least in my opinion, Madam Speaker, is inefficient; and it hinders the effective planning of our intelligence operations. And this bill very importantly takes a major step away from reliance on those supplementals and seeks to provide full funding to fight terrorism and for intelligence operations in Iraq.

There is also increased funding for critical initiatives such as foreign language training for our troops in the field and for greater numbers of defense intelligence analysts. This intelligence authorization bill builds upon actions already taken by the House Committee on Armed Services dictating a career path for military linguists, and we should be very proud of this initiative in these regards.

The net result, Madam Speaker, is that our intelligence personnel and our military will be better trained and equipped to perform their invaluable missions. These are important steps, and they have been taken with the necessary consultation with the Committee on Armed Services. And I am happy to report that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has

worked very closely with the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER), with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), distinguished ranking member, with respect to our authorizations. And I would certainly argue that they complement one another very closely. To the extent that there are differences, and I think differences are and will continue to be inevitable, I know all of us on both sides of the aisle and in both committees will work to constructively breach those differences and bring about agreements on remaining issues as the authorization process continues.

So I urge unanimous support of this very fine piece of legislation.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), ranking member on the Intelligence Policy Subcommittee.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding me this time, and I also thank the chairman and the staff for putting together in a congenial atmosphere a good bill.

There are some good features to the bill, and I am pleased that it gives the new Director of National Intelligence the authority and resources necessary for him to succeed, and I am also satisfied that the bill gives the intelligence community 100 percent of the funds that it needs for counterterrorism programs. I am encouraged by the bill's emphasis on human intelligence and the recommendation to create a multi-level security clearance system that will allow the intelligence community to harness the power of America's diversity.

More must be done, however, to encourage the use of open source, or public, information. Last year we gave the intelligence community an urging to increase its collection, analysis, and use of open-source information. And I look forward to working with the DNI to move these efforts forward.

I am also pleased that the bill advances our foreign language training efforts within the intelligence community, and I will continue to work with my colleagues to strengthen our language capabilities throughout the Federal Government.

I do want to express serious concern about a couple of matters. First, the administration's recommendations to close or realign military bases has the potential to disrupt vital intelligence expertise. Bases like Fort Monmouth, in my home State of New Jersey, play critical intelligence roles that have not been taken fully into account in the process. I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member for urging the Director of National Intelligence to evaluate the effect of base realignment on our Nation's intelligence capabilities, and I will include their letter at this point in the RECORD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,

Washington, DC, May 26, 2005.

Ambassador JOHN NEGROPONTE,
Director of National Intelligence, New Executive
Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR AMBASSADOR NEGROPONTE: During the markup of the Fiscal Year 2006 Intelligence Authorization bill, Members of the Committee raised questions about the potential impacts that the Defense Department's Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission recommendations could have on the nation's intelligence capabilities. The Members believe strongly that such impacts should be factored into the final decision process.

Many intelligence programs, for example, are dependent on subject matter experts made up of military personnel, government civilians, and contractors. These people form the analytic depth and breadth of the Intelligence Community, as well as much of the core of its engineering, scientific and technical expertise. Based on past BRAC experiences, we can logically assume that many of the intelligence personnel that would be affected by the latest recommendations could refuse to uproot their families and relocate. The Intelligence Community depends on this intellectual capital, and we should well understand how the resulting loss of these people would affect intelligence activities and, thereby, the nation's security.

The BRAC recommendations could affect the nation's intelligence capabilities in many other ways. Accordingly, we want to ensure that these intelligence-related impacts be considered in the deliberations that result in the final BRAC decisions. We believe that your position as the Director of National Intelligence puts you in a unique position to best understand and, accordingly, respond to these potential impacts.

Therefore, we ask you to evaluate the affects of base realignment and closure on the nation's intelligence capabilities. We further ask that you provide the Committee with the results of your review no later than the date that the President provides his final approval and certification of the BRAC report to the Congress.

Sincerely,

PETER HOEKSTRA,
Chairman.
JANE HARMAN,
Ranking Member.

Madam Speaker, I also express my deep disappointment with the decision of the Committee on Rules to disallow a moderate and reasonable amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) that would have mandated the creation of a 9/11-style commission to investigate how the executive branch has handled detainees. We need that investigation, and we can do some of it within the committee; but we do need a public 9/11-style commission.

Madam Speaker, I support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, I served for 6 years on the Committee on Armed Services and came to admire greatly our next speaker.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), ranking member.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I certainly thank the gentlewoman for

yielding me this time. She is doing such a superb job on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. We thank her for her efforts, along with the chairman as well.

Let me say I rise in support of this intelligence authorization bill. In doing so, I want to make a few observations about the state of our national intelligence capabilities, as well as some comments about the bill.

Within the span of 2 years, the United States had two very obvious and public examples of intelligence failures: the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks; and the completely incorrect conclusions reached about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs. These and other failures have been recognized by both the 9/11 Commission and the Robb-Silberman Commission on Weapons of Mass Destruction.

Last year's intelligence reform bill was an important first step in rectifying deficiencies in our intelligence capabilities. I believe intelligence is the tip of the spear. It is the tip of the spear in helping our warfighters. The new Director of National Intelligence represents an important benchmark in the creation of a Goldwater-Nichols-like structure for our intelligence community.

The Goldwater-Nichols law, as we all know, altered command relationships among our military services in such a way that has fostered joint operations and enabled our military to become the very best in the world.

□ 1515

I am optimistic that the new director of Intelligence will be able to unify the group of disparate intelligence organizations that comprise the intelligence community to produce better capability, communication, and inoperability than has been the case in the past. I am also pleased that the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman Hoekstra) have been able to resolve their differences over the transfer of personnel who perform intelligence functions.

While the establishment of the director of National Intelligence is an important step, I believe much more remains to be done if we are to really improve our intelligence capability. First, I think Congress needs to do a better job of overseeing our intelligence operations than it has in the past. My own view is that some of our intelligence failures could have been avoided with vigorous congressional oversight.

Second, we need to aggressively follow up on the 9/11 Commission's recommendations.

We need to expand our efforts to secure international stores of nuclear materials, particularly in the nations of the former Soviet Union. Governor Kean, co-chair of the 9/11 Commission, recently said there is no greater danger to our country than a terrorist group acquiring these materials. I want to echo his

concern that we must be sensitive to the fact that intelligence activities can sometimes intrude upon the lives of Americans. In a free society, we must have checks and balances. I think we need to appoint a Federal civil liberties board to prevent and redress constitutional abuses by intelligence and law enforcement agencies. Although last year's law created a civil liberties board, the administration has yet to name any members to the board, something that is long overdue.

Madam Speaker, this is a good bill I believe members should support. I commend the gentleman from Michigan, Chairman HOEKSTRA, and the gentlewoman from California, Ranking Member HARMAN, for a job well done.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, and our partner in making sure that we have a solid and strong intelligence community as well as the best fighting forces, the best military in the world.

Mr. HUNTER. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for his kind words. It is appropriate that I follow the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri and his remarks, because he talked about Goldwater-Nichols, and Goldwater-Nichols did drive jointness in the military.

Another thing that Goldwater-Nichols did, and it was primarily as a result of the debacle in Lebanon with the marines, is to drive what was known as the chain of command rule, meaning that when you had a combatant commander, formerly known as a CINC, that combatant commander was in charge of everything in that warfighting theater, whether it was a rivet joint aircraft or a soldier or a marine, special operator, or a tactical intelligence gatherer in that area. That was a major issue that we had to work on, and we had to build a seam and a protection for the chain of command and, at the same time, afford to the national intelligence gatherers the resources and the opportunity to carry out their mission.

I think that the bill, the 9/11 bill did a pretty good job of that, and I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman HOEKSTRA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ranking Member HARMAN) for their participation in working that. My good colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and I really look forward to Mr. Negroponte getting off to the right start. He is a guy with a lot of good judgment, great experience in very difficult and inconvenient and dangerous missions, in my estimation, and I think that is probably a requisite for this job.

I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) also, because there were a couple of provisions in this bill that we thought had a chain of command problem, and he looked at those and worked on them and took them out in the rule, and I want to let

him know I appreciate that. That was important to us. We are working together, and we both want to see this new apparatus, this intelligence apparatus that has to work so well with the defense apparatus moving off to a good new start in this war against terror.

So my thanks to the chairman and thanks to the ranking member. We have a lot of work to do, but we have a good bill here, and I hope every Member supports it.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say to the last speaker that I applaud his comments about the need for this new legislation to succeed. It is critical, in my view, to move from a 1947 business model, which is the one we were operating under, to this one.

I also would point out to our colleagues, as the last speaker knows, that battlefield intelligence is not included in the DNI construct that we built.

Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER), a recent addition to our committee, who is a very active member of our new Subcommittee on Oversight.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Madam Speaker, as my colleagues have pointed out, a lot of good, hard, work has been put into this bill, which places our committee and the intelligence community on the path of success for achieving the goals set forth in the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission and the WMD Commissions. The turf battles are ending and we now have a director of National Intelligence to oversee and coordinate efforts, but we all must work together in order to make sure that the DNI can succeed.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman HOEKSTRA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ranking Member HARMAN) for leading by example and promoting bipartisan efforts in our oversight role. I also want to thank our staff for their hard work.

Our newly established Subcommittee on Oversight has already taken the reins of leadership and is investigating the abuses that have occurred in our interrogation and detention programs. These abuses only serve to embolden terrorist actions against us and it increases risk to our military forces and American citizens abroad. These abuses also hurt our reputation abroad and allow the insurgents to recruit people to attack us.

I also look forward to continuing work with my colleagues on solutions to the security clearance challenges faced by the intelligence community and State and local governments who need to access information to protect our homeland. This bill's endorsement of a multilevel security clearance system will enhance flexibility in hiring practices and access to information. Current clearance wait times sometimes exceed a year. Terrorists will not wait a year, and neither can we.

Let me close by praising the excellent work of the Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Center and the National Security Agency, NSA, based in my district. Our committee recognizes their challenges, and we fully support their efforts in the global war on terrorism and in Iraq and Afghanistan. I urge my Democratic colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Speaker, as we take a look at the technical programs and we take a look at the structure of the intelligence community, at the end of the day it is about the people in the intelligence community. As we have conducted our oversight responsibilities in developing this bill, we have had the opportunity to meet and work with many of the intelligence professionals throughout the community and around the world. I believe I can speak for the rest of my colleagues when I say that we hold in the highest regard the work accomplished by these dedicated U.S. intelligence community personnel.

At great sacrifice, often under extreme and intense conditions, and at great personal risk, the men and women of the intelligence community continue to perform their missions with great energy, professionalism, and devotion to the national security mission. I commend these patriots for their heroism, their integrity, and their perseverance. These honorable people form the first line of defense for our Nation. Our freedoms and the very security of our country rely on their successes. Those successes are things we cannot and do not often have the opportunity to talk about.

Unfortunately, and quite wrongly, it is the rare but overlooked publicized failures that they are credited with. I stand here today and say thank you to these tremendous people. They deserve our support, and that is what we are doing with this legislation today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, I associate myself totally with the comments that our chairman just made.

Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY), our rookie on our side.

Mr. TIERNEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I rise to discuss H.R. 2475. It is a bill that, as people have said, takes a number of steps to strengthen our intelligence capabilities and, for those reasons, is supportable. Nevertheless, like most bills, it has parts that need to be moved on and worked on still.

As was mentioned, I am new to this committee, so first I want to recognize the efforts of all of my colleagues on the committee and the staff who did incredible work on this. I also want to acknowledge the fact that my minority colleagues have been outspoken during the past couple of years on a number of

issues, and I want to thank them and my majority colleagues for incorporating those issues in this bill and, of course, the majority adding their own approval.

On the plus side, as has been mentioned, 100 percent funding for counterterrorism in the base budget is a huge step forward. We need to make sure we build on that. The White House proposal to fund 60 percent of that in a supplemental budget would have undermined our plans and operations, so 100 percent is a big step in the right direction. The bipartisan willingness to keenly scrutinize architectural programs for the quality, for the program management, for the budget responsibility, for cost is also important. It is helpful to allow for investments in human intelligence, and it can bring more public confidence to the work we do in this area.

I think it would be well-placed to put that kind of scrutiny on the whole budget at large, and I think we should consider making more of the Select Committee on Intelligence budget process public, to the extent possible, including at least the aggregate amount of money being spent so that the public will be able to focus on that and have more confidence.

The best intelligence oversight begins with looking at the 9/11 Commission's recommendations for reform of Congress's intelligence committees. We still need to do a considerable amount of work there concerning how those committees will be formulated and what budgetary appropriation aspect will be within what body. We need renewed oversight, and the Subcommittee on Oversight that has been formed and mentioned earlier is an improvement. Its time would be well spent if we ensure that the DNI and the DNI office is set up largely in line with Commission recommendations. We do not need another sprawling bureaucracy. It will be well-served to have a streamlined executive staff that utilizes existing agencies and moves forward on that basis. And it has to have the authority to ensure that the network agencies are reformed, coordinated, and effective. It also needs the authority to make sure that we have the appropriate budgetary and personnel powers within the DNI to work.

The DNI should follow the recommendation of the blue ribbon commission to establish a Civil Liberties Board and ensure that it effectively protects the civil liberties, even as we make sure aggressive intelligence measures are pursued. This too is essential to maintain public trust. It is as important as it is to require that we use taxpayer money wisely, and it is every bit as essential that our intelligence operate within the law.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I would like to get to some of the specifics of the legislation. I want to make an observation about the overall position we have

taken. It is my belief, and we have seen it today, that we may be harshly criticized by some for being too bold or aggressive with some of our actions. Indeed, we have already been told that we were not incremental enough. I want to take head-on those who take such positions.

There is no question that what is being proposed today is bold and sweeping in some areas. Without getting into the classified specifics, based on our strategic review, we are cutting back dramatically in some cases, on some technical programs that have had poor performance or could be modified for better utility for the Nation's intelligence efforts.

We are terminating some programs that we do not believe fit in the overall architecture for the intelligence community. We have analyzed these programs extensively, asked the tough questions, and focused on the resulting intelligence output. To paraphrase from a Hollywood movie line, these programs have been weighed, they have been measured, and they have been found wanting.

We are then taking the resulting savings and applying that to historically underfunded areas in the human intelligence and human capital areas. Specifically, we are focusing needed emphasis on adding human intelligence specialists, improving the training of analysts, improving the training of case officers, and making more robust the infrastructure necessary to gain their expertise, and then better employ that expertise.

We have quite simply in the past paid too much lip service to those basic needs, while continuing to fund expensive technical programs that, although important, do not make up for the lack of analysts, lack of worldwide coverage, lack of training, and lack of basic infrastructure. In sum, we are doing the heavy lifting that should have been done long ago. We are acting boldly and positively on the task our former chairman gave us.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to comment on the remarks the chairman just made.

Madam Speaker, it is not a zero-sum game, it is not a trade-off between what we call HUMINT, that is, human intelligence, which is primarily the use of spies to tell us the plans and intention of the bad guys, and technology. It is a positive-sum game, or we hope it is a positive-sum game, that balances correctly our investments in HUMINT and our investments in technology.

I said earlier that my home State of California makes many of the technical platforms that we use effectively to gather intelligence. I agree with our chairman that we should take a clear-eyed look at what works and what does not work and what capabilities we need to defeat present and future threats. But some of us, I would say a majority on the minority side, believe that the

weighing, measuring, and finding wanting that has gone on in this bill needs further review, that the balance can be better struck.

I look forward to working with the chairman on a better balance as this bill comes to conference, keeping in mind that we want a positive-sum outcome.

Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a very serious Member of this body, not on our committee.

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I thank my gentle friend and colleague from California for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of the national intelligence bill. I want to thank the committee for its great work. I especially want to focus my praise on the gentlewoman from California (Ranking Member HARMAN) for her great work in leading on this issue. It was Democrats, led by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), that pushed the 9/11 Commission to be started last year, as the Republicans and the White House blocked their work and opposed their mission. I believe the Republicans fear the truth that may come from that Commission.

Later, when the 9/11 Commission issued its recommendations and the Speaker said he would not implement any legislative changes without a majority of the majority, it was again Democrats and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) who led the fight for a real intelligence shakeup and for the creation of a director of National Intelligence.

□ 1530

Democrats fixed those problems and fought back changes this year to bring us back to the bad old days of intelligence turf wars.

This bill reflects the new world we live in, a dangerous world that has gotten more dangerous since September 11; and we need to be involved, and more heavily involved, to protect all Americans, no matter where they are on this planet and the bill does that.

Representing one of the most diverse congressional districts in the U.S., I interact with a number of immigrants and their families who are from every corner of the globe. And the one thing that unifies them all is their love of this great country. And they can and will be helpful in helping this country infiltrate terror networks that threaten our country.

This bill will help them do that.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Speaker, I want to just first compliment the chairman and ranking member for their excellent work on this legislation, their excellent work in general, and frankly the work that they have done in helping to

create such a strong structure for intelligence.

The Cold War is over. The world is a more dangerous place. We need to be able to not contain and react to an event; we need to be able to detect and prevent it. It means that we need very good intelligence, both intelligence directed with technology and intelligence that occurs from very good human capital.

I think the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and our incredible ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), have done an excellent job in drafting this legislation. My compliments to both of them. They give credit to the full Congress and the work that they have done.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the last speaker for his generous words and ask how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) has 8½ minutes remaining.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, we at the moment have no other speakers on the floor. And I reserve the right to close for our side.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, we have no additional speakers at this time either, so I believe I have the right to close. The gentlewoman will close on her side, and we will have no additional speakers. I will close on our side.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time.

Madam Speaker, the last 4 years have witnessed two of the worst intelligence failures in our Nation's history. Congress passed intelligence reform and created the DNI position to give the brave women and men of the intelligence community the tools they need to collect and analyze accurate and timely intelligence.

We cannot have any more catastrophic failures where we fail to connect the dots or believe too fervently in the claims of bogus sources. This legislation, the authorization bill we are considering today, is the first funding bill under our new intelligence organization.

It is a strong bill that deserves our support. As we said earlier, for the first time we fully funded counterterrorism in the base budget so we can plan CT operations against our enemies. For the first time we have urged the DNI to create multitier security clearances so we can field a diverse group of intelligence officers who speak the languages and understand the cultures of our adversaries.

I am proud to say these were two ideas offered by the committee Democrats that gained bipartisan support in our committee. As I have said, there are ways this bill can be improved further. And I look forward to working on

this as we move to conference. But this is a bipartisan product that deserves bipartisan support.

And before I close, I do want to thank again the hard-working members on both sides of the committee who put so much effort into it day after day, and moreover the hard-working staff on a bipartisan basis.

And let me just identify those on the minority side who are sitting on the floor with me today: David Buckley, staff director; Chuck Gault, deputy staff director; Jeremy Bash, general counsel; Mike DeLaney; Larry Hanauer; John Keefe; Pam Moore; Wyndee Parker, special counsel; and Christine York. They make us look good, and I urge passage of this legislation before us.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

(Mr. HOEKSTRA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, today before closing general debate, I would like to briefly offer congratulations and recognition to Mr. Charles G. Allen, as many of us know him, Charlie, as he completes his tour of duty as the assistant director of the Central Intelligence Agency for collection.

He has served the intelligence community with great distinction, and I will later seek consent in the House to submit a more lengthy tribute into the RECORD.

But just briefly, he is a native of North Carolina. Mr. Allen has served the Central Intelligence Agency and the Nation with distinction since 1958, holding a variety of positions of increasing responsibility, both in analytical and managerial capacity. He served overseas in an intelligence liaison capacity from 1974 to 1977, and from 1977 to 1980 he held management positions of increasing responsibility and importance in the Directorate of Intelligence.

I think that all of the Members in the House, and all of the Members and the staff on the committee who have gotten to know Mr. Allen over the last number of years, number one, we are glad that he is still working on special assignment with Mr. Goss; but we really want to extend our congratulations to him for almost slightly over 45 years of service to this country within the intelligence community, a real national asset in the intelligence business.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD a statement on Assistant Director Allen.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer congratulations and recognition to Mr. Charles E. Allen as he completes his tour of duty as the Assistant Director of Central Intelligence for Collection. Since its creation by the Congress 7 years ago, he has served in this position with distinction.

Mr. Allen was appointed as the first Assistant Director of Central Intelligence for Collec-

tion. As such, he was responsible for Intelligence Community collection management, and specifications for our next generation of collection systems. During these past 7 years he has come to personify the position, personify the management of this nation's scarce intelligence collection assets, confound his early critics, and overall achieve positive results beyond even the expectations of his supporters, who are legion. His service has been a great asset, and Congress has regularly drawn upon his experience and judgment.

A native of North Carolina, Mr. Allen has served the Central Intelligence Agency and the Nation with distinction since 1958, holding a variety of positions of increasing responsibility both in analytic and managerial capacities. He served overseas in an intelligence liaison capacity from 1974 to 1977, and from 1977 to 1980 he held management positions of increasing responsibility and importance in the Directorate of Intelligence.

Mr. Allen served as program manager of a major classified project, from 1980 to 1982 in the Office of the Director of Central Intelligence, and was subsequently detailed to the Office of the Secretary of Defense where he held a senior position in strategic mobilization planning.

In 1985 the Director of Central Intelligence requested Mr. Allen's return from the Secretary of Defense's office to serve as the National Intelligence Officer for Counterterrorism, and later as Chief of Intelligence in the CIA's newly established Counterterrorist Center. Many of Mr. Allen's successes have and shall continue to remain secret, but two that have become more publicly known illustrate his contributions; he played a key role in apprehending the hijackers who killed an American citizen on the cruise ship *Achille Lauro*, and he correctly brought to the DCI's attention certain matters which served to stimulate the Iran-Contra investigation.

Mr. Allen served as the National Intelligence Officer for Warning from 1988 to 1994 and chaired the Intelligence Community's Warning Committee. From these positions he issued timely warnings of events of momentous importance, confounding most intelligence officers who did not share his prescience.

Mr. Allen was awarded the National Intelligence Medal for Achievement in 1983 by DCI Casey and the President's Award for Distinguished Federal Civilian Service in 1986 by President Reagan. In 1991, he was presented the CIA Commendation Medal for provision of warning intelligence in Desert Shield/Desert Storm.

He and his wife, Kay, reside in Herndon, Virginia, where they raised four children.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Allen has already enjoyed a long and luminous career in intelligence, and as he steps down from his current position I hope all my colleagues will recognize the extraordinary contributions Mr. Charles E. Allen has made to our National Security as a lifelong professional intelligence officer. I hope my colleagues will honor him as a great American and pioneer in the management of intelligence collection inter alia.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our confidence in his continued ability and willingness to serve the Nation as she shall call upon him.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HARMAN. I thank the chairman for yielding to me. Charlie Allen is as close as you can come to a legend in the intelligence community. Before the intelligence reform bill passed last year, he was one of the few senior intelligence officers who could get 15 disparate agencies to function as a community. He did that mainly through sheer force of personality.

Our Nation collects intelligence through a variety of means, from spies on the ground to satellites overhead, and everything in between. In his capacity as the assistant director for collection, Charlie got the collectors to understand that they were most effective when they worked together as a team against the hardest targets.

He got them to understand that integrated collection strategies yielded the best outcomes. Under Charlie's leadership, the collectors in the intelligence community have scored some truly impressive victories, and it is unfortunate that these cannot be recounted in public.

I will just tell you that Charlie's service to the Nation was made clear to me the day he told the committee that he had been with the CIA for nearly 50 years. That is an astounding record, and it is certainly appropriate as we close debate on what I think is one of the best authorization bills ever, that we recognize Charlie's service to our Nation.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, in closing, again I would like to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the staff on both sides of the aisle who have worked to put together a very, very good bill, my colleagues on my side of the aisle.

We have put together, I think, a very, very strong bill. I think it deserves broad bipartisan support. It sets us in the right direction. As my colleague has indicated, there is more work to do. We do need to take a look at the technical programs. These are critical to the long-term success of our intelligence community, to make sure that public policymakers have the information that we need to make the right decisions.

I appreciate the gentlewoman from California's (Ms. HARMAN) support as we have gone through this process and recognizing that there are issues and concerns about the performance of some of these programs and so that we have the agreement on that.

Where we are disagreeing and having some discussions right now is what is the most effective way to respond to those problems and issues. We want accountability. We want performance. We want to spend the taxpayer dollars wisely. And I am sure that as we continue to go through this process, work with our colleagues on the other side of this building, and work with the administration, we will come to a conclusion, hopefully, that we can all agree to.

I applaud the committee and our work in taking some of these steps

that I think we all recognize needed to be taken and that we are committed to addressing those problems.

With that, Madam Speaker, I would encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, the preamble to the Constitution tells us that one of the first responsibilities of the Federal government is to "provide for the common defense."

My 10 years on the House Intelligence Committee have given me an appreciation for the vital role the men and women in our intelligence agencies play in doing just that.

Many of them take extraordinary risks on a daily basis in an effort to gather the information policy makers and military commanders need to make sound decisions. They are deeply dedicated to preserving our country's security, and each of us is grateful for their hard work and sacrifice.

They need an intelligence system that is as strong, smart, and competent as they are, and this bill takes several strong steps towards making sure we have that system.

I want to commend Chairman HOEKSTRA and Ranking Member HARMAN for their leadership and hard work in making sure that this legislation addresses not only the immediate needs of the intelligence community, but helps plan for the future as well.

However, it would be a mistake for us to pass this bill and declare that our work is done and that we have fulfilled our responsibility to the intelligence community and the American people.

It has now been more than 1,700 days since the September 11th terrorist attacks changed our Nation, and laid bare the holes in our intelligence gathering system.

It has been 11 months since the independent 9/11 Commission issued its findings and made its recommendations about how to close those gaps.

It has been nearly a year since the Senate Intelligence Committee concluded that our intelligence on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capabilities was fundamentally flawed—a conclusion that was recently confirmed by the Presidential Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the United States Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction.

In part, this bill provides the resources the intelligence community needs to prepare for the future by learning from mistakes made in the past. However, these recent reports—notably those of the 9/11 Commission and the Robb-Silberman Commission—point to the need to do far more than simply fund the intelligence community.

These two commissions made many recommendations for significant change in the way the intelligence agencies operate and are overseen by Congress, the way the intelligence community is managed, and in other matters associated with better protecting the American people from the threats posed by terrorists, particularly terrorists armed with weapons of mass destruction.

It was an intelligence authorization bill that established the 9/11 Commission, and it is therefore appropriate that in the context of the debate on this authorization measure, and with the first anniversary of the release of the Commission's report and recommendations fast approaching, we reflect on the recommendations that have been implemented, and on those that have not.

The Commission concluded that more centralized management of the intelligence community was needed, and that the manager had to have considerable power over people and money. The first Director of National Intelligence, Ambassador Negroponte is now in office. He faces a daunting task. We all hope he is successful in it.

That is why it was so surprising and regrettable that the Intelligence Committee, over the objections of Congresswoman HARMAN and the other Democratic Members, chose to welcome him with an effort to restrict his power. What a terribly negative message that provision sent about the commitment of the majority to intelligence reform. This bill is much improved with that provision removed, as the rule has done.

The impetus for this ill-advised action reportedly came from officials in the Department of Defense. We created the position of DNI to help address the interagency squabbling that leads to intelligence failures. This is simply no place for power grabs or bureaucratic self-protection and preservation on the part of the Pentagon.

Just as it was an intelligence authorization bill that created the 9/11 commission, I had hoped that this intelligence authorization would include Mr. WAXMAN's proposal to create a commission to investigate the prisoner abuses in Afghanistan, at Abu Ghraib, and at Guantánamo.

That will not occur as a result of actions taken by the Republican majority on the Rules Committee. For our international standing, our sense of fairness and decency, and to establish more effective means of intelligence gathering, these abuses must be examined.

As former Ambassador Thomas Pickering, attorney Floyd Abrams, and our former colleague Bob Barr wrote in *The Washington Post* on June 7: "This is a time when we should be making extra efforts to reach out to Muslims and to ask them to work with us in the war against terrorism. Instead, our failure to undertake a thorough and credible investigation has caused severe resentment of the United States."

Some of those who opposed most strongly an independent investigation of the 9/11 attacks also oppose an independent investigation of the prisoner abuse scandal. That is unacceptable.

But just as the American people would not accept the initial refusal to establish a 9/11 Commission, so too will demands continue for an independent commission to investigate the prisoner abuses in Iraq, Guantanamo Bay, and elsewhere.

Our country's standing in the eyes of the world depends on getting to the bottom of the prisoner abuse matter—a fact that will ultimately force the majority of this House to stop placing obstacles in the path of a full and independent inquiry.

Unfortunately this is not the only initiative this Congress has failed to act on. Despite the unanimity with which they were adopted and the near universal acclaim they have produced, some critical recommendations made by the 9/11 Commission have gone unfulfilled. For example, Chairman Kean pointed earlier this month to the failure to allocate more of the broadcast spectrum to first responder communications as "almost a scandal." Congresswoman HARMAN has been a leader in trying to resolve this problem and I congratulate her for her efforts.

Chairman Kean also emphasized what has long been known to Members of the Intelligence Committee: the greatest danger facing the United States is a terrorist attack involving weapons of mass destruction, and the best way to address that is to safeguard or destroy WMD components, especially nuclear material, at its source.

Intelligence plays a huge role in efforts to combat proliferation of nuclear material and technology, but money is needed to better protect or acquire these materials in the countries where they were developed. We are simply not providing enough resources to this effort.

Finally, the 9/11 Commissioners have been clear in their assessment that, unless Congress overhauls the procedures by which it oversees the work of the intelligence agencies, intelligence reform will not be successful.

The House has not undertaken the kind of comprehensive review of the oversight process that the Commission believes to be necessary. I have let the Speaker know, repeatedly, that Democrats are prepared to work cooperatively on this review. It is imperative that we begin this task soon—we have already waited far too long.

This bill enjoys broad bipartisan support from members of the Committee, and I intend to support it. In doing so, however, I urge that the House dedicate itself to finishing the job begun last fall with the adoption of the 9/11 intelligence reform bill and address completely all of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission.

Mr. EVERETT. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2475, the Intelligence Authorization Bill for fiscal year 2006.

As one of several "cross-over" members who serve on both the Intelligence and Armed Services Committees, this legislation strikes a reasonable balance between our national intelligence needs, and the needs of our warfighters. As we know from our work on the Intelligence Reform Act last fall, this is not an easy task.

Madam Speaker, it would be disingenuous to state that all is well within the Intelligence Community. For a number of years, the Select Committee on Intelligence has been systematically identifying major shortfalls in providing for our foreign intelligence needs. These include: funding shortfalls, major limitations in human intelligence, limited capabilities in foreign language specialists, aging information technology systems, and the lack of strategic planning with regard to the Intelligence Community's overhead intelligence collection programs.

Madam Speaker, this bill represents a major step forward in correcting many of these problems by funding programs, operations, and personnel that are vital to the security of the United States. The policies and programs in this bill will enable us to strengthen our intelligence capabilities to ensure that we are providing the best foreign intelligence efforts possible.

In particular, this bill begins to balance the resources applied to technical collection programs with those applied to human source collection. In years past, funding cuts greatly reduced the Intelligence Community's ability to provide global collection and analytic coverage. The global war on terrorism has led to increased funding, but there is still only limited capability to focus on other issues around the

world. This bill reinvigorates capabilities that have long been ignored.

I have a personal concern about the Intelligence Community's capabilities against foreign missile systems. Therefore, at my direction the bill includes specific funding increases to allow for expanded modeling and simulation of foreign systems, exploitation of foreign missile systems, and all-source missile event analysis.

Madam Speaker, this bill puts a great deal of emphasis on getting the Intelligence Community "back to the basics." In short, this bill continues to correct the systemic problems that left us underprepared for warning against terrorist attacks on America, and begins the process of returning human intelligence collection to a worldwide endeavor.

I feel that this is a good bill that balances the increased investment against critical priorities with procedures for effectively monitoring the wise investment of the taxpayers' money. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2475.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2475, "The Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006". I thank my friend and colleague from Michigan for yielding me this time.

For almost 4 years, the U.S. Intelligence Community has been at the forefront of the Global War on Terror. Working long hours, under often primitive conditions, the men and women of the Intelligence Community have performed spectacularly under the most stressing of operational tempos. The legislation before us today authorizes the funding necessary to support the men and women of the Intelligence Community and to keep our country safe. However, a sufficient balance must be maintained between fighting terror and maintaining global awareness of emerging threats. Therefore, the legislation before us lays the budgetary and programmatic groundwork that will ensure that the U.S. Intelligence Community is prepared and able to face the challenges and national security threats of the future.

First and foremost, this legislation provides the appropriate balance between technical, human and open source collection.

This bill provides sufficient funds to ensure that the U.S. retains its technical collection edge for the next 20 years. It also increases the resources necessary to provide a strong, global human and open source intelligence collection capability. Achieving this balance required some hard choices on several highly regarded technical collection systems, however, the Committee was able to reach bipartisan consensus on the need to eliminate some redundant or outdated systems.

Second, this legislation strengthens innovation across the Intelligence Community.

The legislation includes a significant increase in the resources devoted to advanced research and technology development including increased funding for new sensors and platforms, data mining and information assurance technologies. To ensure that these resources are used wisely, this legislation also strengthens the authorities and responsibilities of the Intelligence Community's Chief Scientist.

Third, this legislation revitalizes our intelligence analysis and production capabilities.

Our intelligence community analysts are frequently asked to turn fragmentary and seem-

ingly random puzzle pieces into a coherent picture. To help bring the picture into focus, this legislation provides for improved training opportunities (particularly for languages), new analytic tools, increased personnel and better tools to enable information sharing.

Fourth and finally, this legislation continues the efforts begun in the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 to strengthen and define the authorities and responsibilities of the Director of National Intelligence.

The Intelligence Community is our first-line of defense against an elusive and unstructured threat that has shown willingness to harm America. It is vital that this community has the resources and authorities necessary to effectively target both the terrorist threats of today as well as new threats of tomorrow. H.R. 2475 provides those resources.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation in the bipartisan manner that our national security efforts demand.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2475, the Intelligence Authorization Act of 2006. I congratulate Chairman HOEKSTRA for presenting a strong bill that addresses our major intelligence requirements.

Madam Speaker, as chair of the Intelligence Policy Subcommittee, I have been tasked to look at the vast range of threats faced by the United States, and work to ensure that the intelligence services devote the necessary resources to respond to those threats.

As we consider this bill, we are in the midst of a war with a vicious enemy—a war on terrorism that must be won. Our troops are also engaged in a bloody effort to stabilize Iraq.

Our war-fighters must have timely, accurate information about the enemy, and this bill makes every effort to guarantee that intelligence is provided. Thus, there is an essential force protection component to this authorization.

But we cannot focus solely on the collection of near-term, tactical battlefield intelligence. We must also ensure that our political leaders have good information about big picture threats to U.S. interests globally.

The Intelligence Community must focus its resources on the nuclear programs in Iran, North Korea, and other major proliferators of weapons of mass destruction.

We must fully understand the ongoing military modernization of China, and know how Beijing intends to use its emerging capabilities. Russia remains a nuclear superpower with thousands of nuclear warheads, and prudence dictates we have good intelligence regarding Russia's intentions.

The behavior of these important nations can have a deep impact on our national security, and the United States must not become the victim of a "strategic surprise".

To protect our people and inform our political leaders, we must have the capability to collect good, accurate information. It is increasingly difficult to predict where the next crisis may erupt, but our leaders must have the ability to anticipate significant events.

H.R. 2475 places much needed emphasis on our collection and analysis capabilities. I am pleased that this bill increases the investment in human intelligence and the capabilities they provide for us.

It provides additional resources for professional training and language education for intelligence officers being deployed overseas.

The legislation also authorizes powerful new tools that will assist our intelligence analysts to sort through and properly understand the information that has been gathered.

At a time when the threats to U.S. national security are so great, H.R. 2475 supports the effort to provide our leaders with focused, timely intelligence. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and once again, I congratulate my chairman on his outstanding effort.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MALONEY

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MALONEY:

At the end of title III (page 14, after line 23) insert the following:

SEC. 310. REPORTS ON FAILURE TO TIMELY IMPLEMENT THE NATIONAL COUNTERTERRORISM CENTER.

(a) INITIAL REPORT ON FAILURE TO MEET DEADLINES IMPOSED UNDER LAW.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall provide written notice to Congress explaining the failure of the executive branch to implement the National Counterterrorism Center, as established under section 119 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by section 1021 of the National Security Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 (title I of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004; Public Law 108-458), by the deadlines imposed under section 1097(a) of such Act for the implementation of such Center, including the failure by the President to nominate an individual to serve as Director of the National Counterterrorism Center.

(b) SUBSEQUENT MONTHLY UPDATES.—The President shall provide to Congress monthly updates to the initial notice to Congress under subsection (a) until the National Counterterrorism Center is fully implemented and operational.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 331, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Our amendment requires the President to keep the Congress and the American people updated monthly on the progress of the implementation and operation of the National Counterterrorism Center until it is fully implemented and operational.

The Congress and the President recognize the National Counterterrorism Center as a critical office for the safety of our country. The Congress and the President agreed that it had to be up and running, fully operational and fully staffed, by June 17, 2005, or last Friday.

While director Admiral John Redd was nominated on June 10, he has yet to be confirmed by the Senate, and he

has many challenges before him, chief among which is to get this center fully staffed and operational.

The Bush administration manages by goals and reports. A fully operational and staffed NCTC is a goal that must be attained as quickly as possible.

The National Counterterrorism Center was a core element of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004. The center must be the central organization for analyzing and integrating all foreign and domestic intelligence on terrorism.

It also is to conduct strategic operational planning for counterterrorism operations at home and abroad, integrating all elements of national power. In short, the NCTC was created to bring all of the pieces together to prevent a future attack. The Congress and the President established June 17, last Friday, as the deadline for the NCTC.

Unfortunately, we cannot stand here today and say that it is fully operational and fully implemented. This is not the only deadline in this important bill to be missed. I have a chart that I requested from the Congressional Research Service. It is an 8-page chart of deadlines.

And what CRS found is no fewer than 22 deadlines have been missed in the first 6 months of this bill becoming law. And many other important deadlines are looming. Some of the deadlines we have missed include: developing a national transportation strategy, a number of port security strategic plans, and streamlining the security clearance process.

We must keep the implementation of this bill on track; hence the need for this amendment. This is not to say that there has not been substantial progress. Prior to the NCTC being created in law, President Bush created the NCTC last August by executive order.

This center has operated for months under the direction of an interim director. A positive step towards the goal of implementation took place on June 10 when Retired Vice Admiral John Redd was nominated to be the permanent director of the NCTC.

□ 1545

I would like to note that when we originally submitted this amendment to the Committee on Rules on June 2, no NCTC director had been nominated. Upon confirmation, the new director and Ambassador Negroponte will be faced with a number of issues before full implementation. Chief among these issues is working out the inconsistencies between the statute and the executive order. The existing inconsistencies which have been identified by CRS hold much danger of creating confusion which could undermine the maximum functioning of the NCTC.

Another example of these inconsistencies relates to the danger that the tactic supplied to foreign intelligence collection may be applied against U.S. citizens. Thus, the importance of a robust Civil Liberties Board, the begin-

nings of which were included in the enacted statute.

This amendment will motivate all of the participants to get the job done to protect the American people. I am confident that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, under the leadership of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), will relentlessly monitor the implementation of these important deadlines. It is too important to the safety of the American people.

Just as the Goldwater-Nichols bill unified the Army, Navy, and Air Force into a single effective fighting force, so too does the intelligence reform legislation draw together the isolated elements of the intelligence community into a unified shield to protect the American people.

The basic function of the NCTC is to prevent another 9/11. As someone who represents a city that was attacked on 9/11, we owe it to the victims and to all Americans to put this central defense mechanism against future attacks in place. We must fulfill the promise of this functional restructuring of the intelligence community for the safety of the American people.

For me, the intelligence bill was the most important bill we passed since I have been in this Congress, and I am deeply grateful to the families of the victims who fought so hard for the enactment of this bill along with the President and my colleagues in this Congress.

Our amendment is a step towards implementing this important bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, but I do not object to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Is there objection to the gentleman from Michigan controlling the time in opposition?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I will not oppose this amendment. I believe the author will have a perfecting amendment.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I appreciate very much the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman HOEKSTRA) not opposing my amendment and all the hard work that he and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) did on the intelligence bill.

I would like to note the concern that the gentleman reported to me or gave to me about the reporting requirement.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT OFFERED BY
MRS. MALONEY

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified to accept

changing the reporting requirement in the amendment from the President to the Director of National Intelligence, Ambassador Negroponte.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment as modified, offered by Mrs. MALONEY:

At the end of title III (page 14, after line 23) insert the following:

SEC. 310. REPORTS ON FAILURE TO TIMELY IMPLEMENT THE NATIONAL COUNTERTERRORISM CENTER.

(a) INITIAL REPORT ON FAILURE TO MEET DEADLINES IMPOSED UNDER LAW.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall provide written notice to Congress explaining the failure of the executive branch to implement the National Counterterrorism Center, as established under section 119 of the National Security Act of 1947, as added by section 1021 of the National Security Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 (title I of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004; Public Law 108-458), by the deadlines imposed under section 1097(a) of such Act for the implementation of such Center, including the failure by the President to nominate an individual to serve as Director of the National Counterterrorism Center.

(b) SUBSEQUENT MONTHLY UPDATES.—The Director of National Intelligence shall provide to Congress monthly updates to the initial notice to Congress under subsection (a) until the National Counterterrorism Center is fully implemented and operational.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is modified. There was no objection.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Reclaiming my time, I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for that change.

I think the reason we are accepting the amendment is in the spirit that it was offered by my colleague from New York and, I believe, my colleague from Connecticut. We on the committee, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) and myself have laid down as one of the parameters and one of the things that we expect from the oversight subcommittee is to vigorously and aggressively track the implementation of the intelligence reform bill.

I agree in the time that the gentlewoman and I have been in Congress together until we pass Federal prison industries reform, this will be one of the most significant pieces of legislation that we will have worked on together.

There are some talking points on the technicality as to what "fully operational" means, and those types of things; and whether it is fully operational now and whether it could have been fully operational before June 17, because that is when the law came into effect, we fully understand and appreciate the concern that the gentlewoman has in bringing this amendment forward, that we on the committee and that Congress and the American people be fully informed as to the progress we are making in implementing the intelligence reform bill.

We are committed to doing that. We are committed to staying informed on

the committee, riding herd over the director of National Intelligence to make sure that this bill is implemented to the full intent of Congress when we passed it.

So it is in light of the spirit of that approach that we accept this amendment.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the ranking member.

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time. I want to commend her and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for the enormous work they did outside the intelligence committee. As we were considering the intelligence reform legislation last year, the faces that I saw on a constant basis were theirs and the families. And I often have said that the families were the wind beneath our wings. I would add a couple of Members of Congress to that, too, and I thank them for all they did.

I am very pleased that the majority is accepting the amendment. It is a good idea for us to make absolutely clear that the NCTC, the National Counter Terrorism Center, is a vital piece of the reform we enacted last year and that it needs to be fully operational ASAP.

To explain further, one of the big mistakes we made leading up to 9/11 is everyone now knows our failure to connect the dots. Obviously, having a fusion center designed for this purpose is a very good way to make sure we do not fail to connect the dots the next time.

So it took, I would say, the introduction of this amendment to cause the President to nominate a very able fellow, Vice Admiral Redd, to be the director of the NCTC. He did that 2 days after this amendment was presented in the Committee on Rules. And perhaps now that we are accepting it as part of today's debate, the NCTC will become fully operational even before that prison reform bill is enacted.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I strongly support this. I support the team that has brought this to us. And I would note to this body, that bill last year that we worked so hard on gets its real sea legs today as the House takes this necessary step in funding its critical parts and in making clear that we will not accept any efforts to roll back the jurisdiction of the DNI, who is going to be the commander of the tip of the spear in this era of terror.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), and I commend his leadership and support on this amendment and his hard work on the intelligence reform committee. We both had many victims that were lost from our respective districts and we worked closely through-

out that period with the families and with our colleagues on that important bill. I thank the gentleman for his hard work.

Mr. SHAYS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time. I thank her for her very hard work and the work again of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN).

I rise, obviously, in support of this amendment that we are offering, as amended, which would require the director of National Intelligence to provide Congress written explanation why the National Counter Terrorism Center, NCTC, is not fully operational since the June 17 deadline set forth in Public Law 108-458.

The Joint Inquiry and the 9/11 Commission both found that the lack of information-sharing and coordination within the intelligence community led to numerous missed opportunities to detect and prevent September 11 terrorist attacks.

The establishment of the NCTC was a key 9/11 Commission recommendation and an integral part of the effort to increase information-sharing and coordination among intelligence agencies.

The director will serve a critical function in our Nation's intelligence capability, as he will report to the President and to the director of National Intelligence.

The NCTC, once fully operational, will be the Nation's primary agency for now analyzing terrorist threats and planning counterterrorism operations at home and abroad.

The deadline by which the NCTC was required by law to be fully operational has passed, and while I am pleased the President nominated Vice Admiral John Redd as the Center's permanent director on June 10, I wish Congress had received this nomination sooner than a week before the deadline so that the Center could have been operational on time.

The bottom line is it has been done. We are making progress. I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) for accepting this amendment and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) as well. It is an amendment that I think deserves passage and I thank them for accepting it.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank my colleagues for working through this amendment and making the necessary changes. As I indicated earlier, we are willing to accept this amendment.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman HOEKSTRA) for accepting the amendment. Certainly certain issues are above partisan politics. The defense, the protection of our Nation, intelligence reform, is certainly among them.

The gentleman and the ranking member have really worked together in the best interest of the American people on this important issue. I thank the gentleman for his support.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to show my support for the men and women who work in the intelligence community each day sacrificing their lives so that we may remain safe. This measure, H.R. 2475, does authorize 100 percent of the funding requests made by the community, which is a positive departure from the measure proposed in 2005, which funded only 26 percent of the requests. In addition, this legislation improves upon the President's request of only 40 percent of the community's counterterrorism funding needs. This departure is important because this measure is the first authorization bill to come to the floor since passage of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (P.L. 108-458)—the families of the victims of 9/11 as well as the entire international community still look to us for responsible action in the area of intelligence.

I also applaud the Committee's inclusion of provisions for the recruitment and clearing of personnel adept in language skills necessary to truly aid our intelligence-gathering and processing initiative.

However, I join my colleagues in disagreeing with Section 305 of the bill as reported out of Committee. This section gives congressional committees a "pocket veto" of the personnel transfers that the new Director of National Intelligence might recommend. Absent passage of the Manager's Amendment offered by Mr. HOEKSTRA, this provision will contravene much of the authority conferred in the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act that was signed into law by the President last year. Public Law 108-458 contains provisions that I offered that deal with commercial alien smuggling such as penalty enhancement as well as an outreach section that would require publication of the enhancements by DHS to act as a deterrent.

I support the amendment that will be offered by my colleague from New York, Mrs. MALONEY that would require a report to Congress until the Director of the National Counterterrorism Center has been confirmed and until the Center is fully functional.

Madam Speaker, for the reasons above stated, I support the legislation with reservations.

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 331, the previous question is ordered on the bill and the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit with instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WAXMAN. I am, Madam Speaker, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Waxman of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2475 to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end, add the following new title:

TITLE V—ESTABLISHMENT OF INDEPENDENT COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE DETAINEE ABUSES

SEC. 501. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

There is established in the legislative branch the Independent Commission on the Investigation of Detainee Abuses (in this title referred to as the "Commission").

SEC. 502. DUTIES.

(a) INVESTIGATION.—The Commission shall conduct a full, complete, independent, and impartial investigation of intelligence and intelligence-related activities carried out in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and any operation within the Global War on Terrorism in connection with abuses of detainees, including but not limited to the following:

(1) The extent of the abuses.
(2) Why the abuses occurred.
(3) Who is responsible for the abuses.
(4) Whether any particular Department of Defense, Department of State, Department of Justice, Central Intelligence Agency, National Security Council, or White House policies, procedures, or decisions facilitated the detainee abuses.

(5) What policies, procedures, or mechanisms failed to prevent the abuses.

(6) What legislative or executive actions should be taken to prevent such abuses from occurring in the future.

(7) The extent, if any, to which Guantanamo Detention Center policies influenced policies at the Abu Ghraib prison and other detention centers in and outside Iraq.

(b) ASSESSMENT, ANALYSIS, AND EVALUATION.—During the course of its investigation under subsection (a), the Commission shall assess, analyze, and evaluate relevant persons, policies, procedures, reports, and events, including but not limited to the following:

(1) The Military Chain of Command.
(2) The National Security Council.
(3) The Department of Justice.
(4) The Department of State.
(5) The Office of the White House Counsel.
(6) The Defense Intelligence Agency and the Central Intelligence Agency.

(7) The approval process for interrogation techniques used at detention facilities in Iraq, Cuba, Afghanistan, and elsewhere.

(8) The integration of military police and military intelligence operations to coordinate detainee interrogation.

(9) The roles and actions of private civilian contractors in the abuses and whether they violated the Military Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act or any other United States statutes or international treaties to which the United States is a party.

(10) The role of nongovernmental organizations' warnings to United States officials about the abuses.

(11) The role of Congress and whether it was fully informed throughout the process that uncovered these abuses.

(12) The extent to which the United States complied with the applicable provisions of the Geneva Conventions of 1949, and the extent to which the United States may have violated international law by restricting the access of the International Committee of the Red Cross to detainees.

(13) The extent to which the United States complied with the applicable provisions of other human rights treaties, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

SEC. 503. COMPOSITION OF COMMISSION.

(a) MEMBERS.—The Commission shall be composed of 10 members, of whom—

(1) 1 member shall be appointed by the President;

(2) 1 member shall be jointly appointed by the minority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the House of Representatives;

(3) 2 members shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate;

(4) 2 members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(5) 2 members shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate; and

(6) 2 members shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(b) QUALIFICATIONS; INITIAL MEETING.—

(1) NONGOVERNMENTAL APPOINTEES.—An individual appointed to the Commission may not be an officer or employee of the Federal Government or any State or local government.

(2) OTHER QUALIFICATIONS.—Individuals that shall be appointed to the Commission should be prominent United States citizens, with national recognition and significant depth of experience in such professions as governmental service, law enforcement, the armed services, law, public administration, intelligence gathering, international human rights and humanitarian law, and foreign affairs.

(3) DEADLINE FOR APPOINTMENT.—All members of the Commission shall be appointed within 45 days following the enactment of this Act.

(4) CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN.—The chairman and vice chairman of the Commission shall be elected by a majority vote of the members.

(5) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet and begin the operations of the Commission as soon as practicable. After its initial meeting, the Commission shall meet upon the call of the chairman or a majority of its members.

(c) QUORUM; VACANCIES.—Six members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—Each member appointed to the Commission shall be independent of any agency, individual, or institution that may be the subject of investigation by the Commission.

SEC. 504. POWERS OF COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) HEARINGS AND EVIDENCE.—The Commission or, on the authority of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out this title—

(A) hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, administer such oaths; and

(B) subject to paragraph (2)(A), require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents,

as the Commission or such designated subcommittee or designated member may determine advisable.

(2) SUBPOENAS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A subpoena may be issued under this subsection only—

(i) by the agreement of the chairman and the vice chairman; or

(ii) by the affirmative vote of 6 members of the Commission.

(B) SIGNATURE.—Subject to subparagraph (A), subpoenas issued under this subsection may be issued under the signature of the chairman or any member designated by a majority of the Commission, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman or by a member designated by a majority of the Commission.

(3) SCOPE.—In carrying out its duties under this Act, the Commission may examine the actions and representations of the current Administration as well as prior Administrations.

(b) CONTRACTING.—The Commission may, to such extent and in such amounts as are provided in appropriation Acts, enter into contracts to enable the Commission to discharge its duties of this Act.

(c) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality of the Federal Government, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purposes of this Act. Each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality shall, to the extent authorized by law, furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the chairman, the chairman of any subcommittee created by a majority of the Commission, or any member designated by a majority of the Commission.

(2) RECEIPT, HANDLING, STORAGE, AND DISSEMINATION.—Information shall only be received, handled, stored, and disseminated by members of the Commission and its staff consistent with all applicable statutes, regulations, and Executive Orders.

(d) ASSISTANCE FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Departments and agencies of the United States may provide to the Commission such services, funds, facilities, staff, and other support services as they may determine advisable and as may be authorized by law.

SEC. 505. PUBLIC HEARINGS.

(a) PUBLIC MEETINGS AND RELEASE OF PUBLIC VERSIONS OF REPORTS.—The Commission shall—

(1) hold public hearings and meetings to the extent appropriate; and

(2) release public versions of the reports required under section 509.

(b) PUBLIC HEARINGS.—Any public hearings of the Commission shall be conducted in a manner consistent with the protection of information provided to or developed for or by the Commission as required by any applicable statute, regulation, or Executive order.

SEC. 506. STAFF OF COMMISSION.

(a) APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION.—The chairman and the vice chairman jointly, in accordance with rules agreed upon by the Commission, may appoint and fix the compensation of a staff director and such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out its functions.

(b) DETAILEES.—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission.

(c) CONSULTANT SERVICES.—The Commission is authorized to procure the services of experts and consultants.

SEC. 507. COMPENSATION AND TRAVEL EXPENSES.

(a) **COMPENSATION.**—Each member of the Commission may be compensated at a reasonable rate for each day during which that member is engaged in the actual performance of the duties of the Commission.

(b) **TRAVEL EXPENSES.**—While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence.

SEC. 508. SECURITY CLEARANCES FOR COMMISSION MEMBERS AND STAFF.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subsection (b), the appropriate Federal agencies or departments shall cooperate with the Commission in expeditiously providing to the Commission members and staff appropriate security clearances to the extent possible pursuant to existing procedures and requirements.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—No person shall be provided with access to classified information under this title without the appropriate required security clearance access.

SEC. 509. REPORTS OF COMMISSION; TERMINATION.

(a) **INTERIM REPORTS.**—The Commission may submit to Congress and the President interim reports containing such findings, conclusions, and recommendations for corrective measures as have been agreed to by a majority of Commission members.

(b) **FINAL REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to Congress and the President a final report containing such findings, conclusions, and recommendations for corrective measures as have been agreed to by a majority of Commission members.

(c) **FORM OF REPORT.**—Each report prepared under this section shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(d) **RECOMMENDATION TO MAKE PUBLIC CERTAIN CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.**—If the Commission determines that it is in the public interest that some or all of the information contained in a classified annex of a report under this section be made available to the public, the Commission shall make a recommendation to the congressional intelligence committees to make such information public, and the congressional intelligence committees shall consider the recommendation pursuant to the procedures under subsection (e).

(e) **PROCEDURE FOR DECLASSIFYING INFORMATION.**—

(1) The procedures referred to in subsection (d) are the procedures described in—

(A) with respect to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, clause 11(g) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, One Hundred Ninth Congress; and

(B) with respect to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, section 8 of Senate Resolution 400, Ninety-Fourth Congress.

(2) In this section, the term “congressional intelligence committees” means—

(A) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

SEC. 510. TERMINATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission, and all the authorities of this Act, shall terminate 60 days after the date on which the final report is submitted under section 509(b).

(b) **ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES BEFORE TERMINATION.**—The Commission may use the 60-day period referred to in paragraph (1) for

the purpose of concluding its activities, including providing testimony to committees of Congress concerning its reports and disseminating the final report.

SEC. 511. FUNDING.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated funds not to exceed \$5,000,000 for purposes of the activities of the Commission under this Act.

(b) **DURATION OF AVAILABILITY.**—Amounts made available to the Commission under subsection (a) shall remain available until the termination of the Commission.

Mr. WAXMAN (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 1600

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. WAXMAN. Madam Speaker, this motion to recommit would amend the bill to add language establishing an independent commission to examine detainee abuses.

In the year since the horrific photographs of prisoner abuse at Abu Ghraib surfaced, more and more instances of detainee abuse from a growing number of locations around the world have come to light.

The reports of detainee abuse are undermining one of our Nation's most valuable assets: our reputation for respect for human rights.

The Pentagon's internal investigations of the abuse allegations have resulted in conflicting conclusions. Some of these reports have been little more than whitewashes.

Congress has failed to conduct a comprehensive public investigation of detainee abuse allegations at Guantanamo, Abu Ghraib, Bagram and other facilities. We have abdicated our constitutional duty to conduct responsible oversight.

My motion to recommit would fill the huge oversight gap. A lack of oversight leads to a lack of accountability, and no accountability breeds arrogance and abuse of power.

It is time for this House to take our oversight responsibility seriously, and I urge a “yes” vote on the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, my colleague.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and commend him for sponsoring this notion of an independent commission to look at detainee abuses.

Mr. Speaker, though I am a strong supporter of this legislation, I think it would be even better if it included language to establish this commission, and so I support the motion to recom-

mit the bill for the purpose of adding the gentleman from California's (Mr. WAXMAN) amendment.

Military historians often talk about the “fog of war.” I believe our intelligence professionals operate in a fog of law, a confusing patchwork of treaties, laws, memos and policies.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution says that it is Congress' responsibility to establish rules concerning captures on land and water. I hope that we will seize this responsibility.

But as Congress studies the policy options going forward, it is vital that we have the facts. Only a bipartisan, independent commission can get to the bottom of what happened among administration policymakers within the military chain of command and out in the field.

The steady stream of revelations about Guantanamo and other facilities around the world erode our moral credibility, just as we are trying to win the hearts and minds of the Arab and Muslim world.

It is vital to our national security, Mr. Speaker, that we fix this problem so that our detention and interrogation policies get us actionable intelligence without creating a whole new generation of terrorist recruits. Pretending that there is no problem is not a strategy for success.

So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, our committee, on a bipartisan basis, is looking into these issues through our Subcommittee on Oversight. I commend our progress; but in addition, I think the public will have more confidence in what we are doing if we also have an outside, independent commission.

In that spirit, I support the Waxman motion to recommit.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the failure to have an investigation of detainee abuse is eroding our moral standard in the world. It is also endangering our Armed Forces and inciting hatred against the United States. As Senator BIDEN said about Guantanamo, it is the greatest propaganda tool for the recruitment of terrorists worldwide.

Some of the allegations that have been repeated over and over again may not be true. In fact, I hope they are not true. President Bush calls them absurd, but we do not know what is true and what is not unless we investigate; and when we refuse to conduct a thorough, independent, credible investigation, the rest of the world thinks we have something to hide.

The independent commission established by this proposal would establish a 10-member bipartisan commission modeled on the successful 9/11 commission. I think we need this. I think we need it badly.

If the Congress had done its job of oversight, we might well say the job is done and we do not need to do anything further; but Congress has done relatively little on this whole matter. The reports that have been issued by the

various investigative agencies have been in conflict.

This is why I ask my colleagues to support this motion to recommit. Vote “aye.”

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) is recognized.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I am a little confused, as I listened to those on the other side as to whether we have or have not done oversight. The author of the amendment says there has been no oversight. My ranking member applauds the work that the committee has done in its role of doing oversight on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. Speaker, we are at a time of war that was not begun by the making of the United States. We are at war against an international terrorist movement that has engaged our country in a clash of values driven by those who fundamentally oppose American democracy and freedom.

The 9/11 Commission emphasized the importance of engaging the terrorists in the “struggle of ideas,” noting that many views in the Muslim world of the United States are “at best uninformed about the United States and, at worst, informed by cartoonish stereotypes among intellectuals who caricature U.S. values and policies. Local newspapers and the few influential satellite broadcasters, like al Jazeera, often reinforce the jihadist theme that portrays the United States as anti-Muslim.”

Mr. Speaker, comments that significantly exaggerate and overstate the situation in Guantanamo Bay do nothing but reinforce the false perceptions of America that have encouraged our enemies.

There is aggressive oversight under way by the executive branch and by Congress into our detention procedures. It is only because of this aggressive oversight and the freedoms provided by American democracy that we are having this discussion in the first place. The system is working properly, and we should continue to let it work; and for those who do not know about the work that is going on, perhaps they could ask.

So when senior Members of Congress, including a member of the minority leadership in the Senate, exaggerate and distort these issues, including by comparing American soldiers to Nazis, those comments do nothing but reinforce the false prejudices abroad that have led us to war.

As an example, I note that the al Jazeera network gave prominent coverage to the remarks of a Member of the Senate comparing the actions of U.S. soldiers to Nazis, Soviet gulags, and a mad regime like Pol Pot’s Khmer Rouge in Cambodia.

A columnist in the Chicago Sun Times said of those remarks: “He should at least be made a little uncom-

fortable over what he’s done.” What did he do? “In a time of war, make an inflammatory libel against his country’s military that has no value whatsoever except to America’s enemies.”

We are better than those who oppose us. Our oversight has exposed our weaknesses. Now is the time to move on.

To quote from President Roosevelt’s “Man in the Arena” speech: “It is not the critic who counts, not the man who points out how the strong man stumbles or where the doer of deeds could have done them better.”

I want this Congress to be seen as a doer of deeds. If we fail, we fail while daringly great. To do anything less would be unworthy of the House of Representatives.

Self-loathing of America on the floor of this House accomplishes nothing but fueling the fires abroad that seek to destroy America’s democracy and our way of life. I encourage my colleagues to vote “no” on this motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes, if ordered, on passage of H.R. 2475 and on the motions to suspend the rules previously postponed in the following order:

H.J. Res. 52, by the yeas and nays,

H. Con. Res. 160, by the yeas and nays,

H. Con. Res. 180, de novo.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 197, nays 228, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 289]

YEAS—197

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd

Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello

Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo

Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslie
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey

Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Michaud
Millender
McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard

NAYS—228

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Chocoma
Coble
Cole (OK)
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)

Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger

Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCauley (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica

Miller (FL) Radanovich
 Miller (MI) Ramstad
 Miller, Gary Regula
 Moran (KS) Rehberg
 Musgrave Reichert
 Myrick Renzi
 Neugebauer Reynolds
 Ney Rogers (AL)
 Northup Rogers (KY)
 Norwood Rogers (MI)
 Nunes Rohrabacher
 Nussle Ros-Lehtinen
 Osborne Royce
 Otter Ryan (WI)
 Oxley Ryan (KS)
 Paul Saxton
 Pearce Schwarz (MI)
 Peterson (PA) Sensenbrenner
 Petri Shadegg
 Pickering Shaw
 Pitts Shays
 Platts Sherwood
 Poe Shimkus
 Pombo Shuster
 Porter Simmons
 Price (GA) Simpson
 Pryce (OH) Smith (NJ)
 Putnam Smith (TX)

NOT VOTING—8

Carter Lewis (GA) Sessions
 Conaway Murphy Young (FL)
 Herseth Pence

□ 1639

Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. GONZALEZ, ETHERIDGE and CHANDLER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 16, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie Blunt Capuano
 Ackerman Boehlert Cardin
 Aderholt Boehner Cardoza
 Akin Bonilla Carnahan
 Alexander Bonner Carson
 Allen Bono Case
 Andrews Boozman Castle
 Baca Boren Chabot
 Bachus Boswell Chandler
 Baird Boucher Chocola
 Baker Boustany Clay
 Baldwin Boyd Cleaver
 Barrett (SC) Bradley (NH) Clyburn
 Barrow Brady (PA) Coble
 Bartlett (MD) Brady (TX) Cole (OK)
 Barton (TX) Brown (OH) Cooper
 Bass Brown (SC) Costa
 Bean Brown, Corrine Costello
 Beauprez Brown-Waite, Cox
 Becerra Ginny Cramer
 Berkley Burgess Crenshaw
 Berman Burton (IN) Crowley
 Berry Butterfield Cubin
 Biggert Buyer Cuellar
 Billirakis Calvert Culberson
 Bishop (GA) Camp Cummings
 Bishop (NY) Cannon Cunningham
 Bishop (UT) Cantor Davis (AL)
 Blackburn Capito Davis (CA)
 Blumenauer Capps Davis (FL)

Davis (IL) Jackson-Lee
 Davis (KY) (TX)
 Davis (TN) Jefferson
 Davis, Jo Ann Jenkins
 Davis, Tom Jindal
 Deal (GA) Johnson (CT)
 DeFazio Johnson (IL)
 DeGette Johnson, E. B.
 Delahunt Johnson, Sam
 DeLauro Jones (NC)
 DeLay Jones (OH)
 Dent Kanjorski
 Diaz-Balart, L. Kaptur
 Diaz-Balart, M. Keller
 Dicks Kelly
 Dingell Kennedy (MN)
 Doggett Kennedy (RI)
 Doolittle Kildee
 Doyle Kilpatrick (MI)
 Drake Kind
 Dreier King (IA)
 Edwards King (NY)
 Ehlers Kingston
 Emanuel Kirk
 Emerson Kline
 Engel Knollenberg
 English (PA) Kolbe
 Eshoo Kuhl (NY)
 Etheridge LaHood
 Evans Langevin
 Everett Lantos
 Farr Larsen (WA)
 Fattah Larson (CT)
 Feeney Latham
 Ferguson LaTourette
 Filner Leach
 Fitzpatrick (PA) Levin
 Flake Lewis (CA)
 Foley Lewis (KY)
 Forbes Linder
 Ford Lipinski
 Fortenberry LoBiondo
 Fossella Lofgren, Zoe
 Foxx Lowey
 Frank (MA) Lucas
 Franks (AZ) Lungren, Daniel
 Frelinghuysen E.
 Gallegly Lynch
 Garrett (NJ) Mack
 Gerlach Maloney
 Gibbons Manzullo
 Gilchrest Marchant
 Gillmor Markey
 Gingrey Marshall
 Gohmert Matheson
 Gonzalez Matsui
 Goode McCarthy
 Goodlatte McCaul (TX)
 Gordon McCollum (MN)
 Granger McCotter
 Graves McCrery
 Green (WI) McGovern
 Green, Al McHenry
 Green, Gene McIntyre
 Grijalva McKeon
 Gutierrez McMorris
 Gutknecht McNulty
 Hall Meehan
 Harman Meek (FL)
 Harris Meeks (NY)
 Hart Melancon
 Hastings (FL) Menendez
 Hastings (WA) Mica
 Hayes Michaud
 Hayworth Millender-
 Hefley McDonald
 Hensarling Miller (FL)
 Herger Miller (MI)
 Higgins Miller (NC)
 Hinchey Miller, Gary
 Hinojosa Miller, George
 Hobson Mollohan
 Hoekstra Moore (KS)
 Holden Moore (WI)
 Holt Moran (KS)
 Honda Moran (VA)
 Hooley Murtha
 Hostettler Musgrave
 Hoyer Myrick
 Hulshof Nadler
 Hunter Napolitano
 Hyde Neal (MA)
 Inglis (SC) Neugebauer
 Inslee Ney
 Israel Northup
 Issa Norwood
 Istook Nunes
 Nussle

Tiberi Walsh
 Tierney Wamp
 Towns Wasserman
 Turner Schultz
 Udall (CO) Watt
 Udall (NM) Waxman
 Upton Weiner
 Van Hollen Weldon (FL)
 Velázquez Weldon (PA)
 Visclosky Weller
 Walden (OR) Westmoreland

NAYS—16

Conyers McKinney Stark
 Duncan Oberstar Waters
 Jackson (IL) Owens Watson
 Kucinich Paul Woolsey
 Lee Payne
 McDermott Rangel

NOT VOTING—8

Carter Lewis (GA) Sessions
 Conaway Murphy Young (FL)
 Herseth Pence

□ 1647

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I was detained and unable to cast a vote on H.R. 2475, the Intelligence Authorization Act for FY06, on June 21, 2005. I was enroute to Brownwood, Texas to attend the funeral of Lance Corporal Mario Castillo, a Marine from the 11th District of Texas. Please let the RECORD reflect that had I been here, I would have voted “yes.”

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO MAKE TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS AND CONFORMING CHANGES IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 2475, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2475, the Clerk be authorized to make such technical and confirming changes as necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the remaining votes will be 5-minute votes.

There was no objection.

APPROVING THE RENEWAL OF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS CONTAINED IN THE BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 52.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) that the House suspend the rules and

pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 52, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 2, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 291]

YEAS—423

Abercrombie	Cunningham	Holden
Ackerman	Davis (AL)	Holt
Aderholt	Davis (CA)	Honda
Akin	Davis (FL)	Hooley
Alexander	Davis (IL)	Hostettler
Allen	Davis (KY)	Hoyer
Andrews	Davis (TN)	Hulshof
Baca	Davis, Jo Ann	Hunter
Bachus	Davis, Tom	Hyde
Baird	DeFazio	Inglis (SC)
Baker	DeGette	Inslée
Baldwin	Delahunt	Israel
Barrett (SC)	DeLauro	Issa
Barrow	DeLay	Istook
Bartlett (MD)	Dent	Jackson (IL)
Barton (TX)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jackson-Lee
Bass	Diaz-Balart, M.	(TX)
Bean	Dicks	Jefferson
Beauprez	Dingell	Jenkins
Becerra	Doggett	Jindal
Berkley	Doolittle	Johnson (CT)
Berman	Doyle	Johnson (IL)
Berry	Drake	Johnson, E. B.
Biggert	Dreier	Johnson, Sam
Bilirakis	Duncan	Jones (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Edwards	Jones (OH)
Bishop (NY)	Ehlers	Kanjorski
Bishop (UT)	Emanuel	Kaptur
Blackburn	Emerson	Keller
Blumenauer	Engel	Kelly
Blunt	English (PA)	Kennedy (MN)
Boehlert	Eshoo	Kennedy (RI)
Boehner	Etheridge	Kildee
Bonilla	Evans	Kilpatrick (MI)
Bonner	Everett	Kind
Bono	Farr	King (IA)
Boozman	Fattah	King (NY)
Boren	Feeney	Kingston
Boswell	Ferguson	Kirk
Boucher	Filner	Kline
Boustany	Fitzpatrick	Knollenberg
Boyd	(PA)	Kolbe
Bradley (NH)	Foley	Kucinich
Brady (PA)	Forbes	Kuhl (NY)
Brady (TX)	Ford	LaHood
Brown (OH)	Fortenberry	Langevin
Brown (SC)	Fossella	Lantos
Brown, Corrine	Fox	Larsen (WA)
Brown-Waite,	Frank (MA)	Larson (CT)
Ginny	Franks (AZ)	Latham
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	LaTourette
Burton (IN)	Gallely	Leach
Butterfield	Garrett (NJ)	Lee
Buyer	Gerlach	Levin
Calvert	Gibbons	Lewis (CA)
Camp	Gilchrest	Lewis (KY)
Cannon	Gillmor	Linder
Cantor	Gingrey	Lipinski
Capito	Gohmert	LoBiondo
Capps	Gonzalez	Lofgren, Zoe
Capuano	Goode	Lowe
Cardin	Goodlatte	Lucas
Cardoza	Gordon	Lungren, Daniel
Carnahan	Granger	E.
Carson	Graves	Lynch
Case	Green (WI)	Mack
Castle	Green, Al	Maloney
Chabot	Green, Gene	Manzullo
Chandler	Grijalva	Marchant
Chocola	Gutierrez	Markey
Cleaver	Gutknecht	Marshall
Clyburn	Hall	Matheson
Coble	Harman	Matsui
Cole (OK)	Harris	McCarthy
Conyers	Hart	McCaul (TX)
Cooper	Hastings (FL)	McCollum (MN)
Costa	Hastings (WA)	McCotter
Costello	Hayes	McCrery
Cox	Hayworth	McDermott
Cramer	Hefley	McGovern
Crenshaw	Hensarling	McHenry
Crowley	Herger	McHugh
Cubin	Higgins	McIntyre
Cuellar	Hinchey	McKeon
Culberson	Hinojosa	McKinney
Cummings	Hobson	McMorris
	Hoekstra	McNulty

Meehan	Price (NC)	Snyder
Meek (FL)	Pryce (OH)	Sodrel
Meeks (NY)	Putnam	Solis
Melancon	Radanovich	Souder
Menendez	Rahall	Spratt
Mica	Ramstad	Stark
Michaud	Rangel	Stearns
Millender-McDonald	Regula	Strickland
Miller (FL)	Rehberg	Stupak
Miller (MI)	Reichert	Sullivan
Miller (NC)	Renzi	Sweeney
Miller, Gary	Reyes	Tancred
Miller, George	Reynolds	Tanner
Mollohan	Rogers (AL)	Tauscher
Moore (KS)	Rogers (KY)	Taylor (MS)
Moore (WI)	Rogers (MI)	Taylor (NC)
Moran (KS)	Rohrabacher	Terry
Moran (VA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Thomas
Murtha	Ross	Thompson (CA)
Musgrave	Rothman	Thompson (MS)
Myrick	Roybal-Allard	Thornberry
Nadler	Royce	Tiahrt
Napolitano	Ruppersberger	Tiberi
Neal (MA)	Rush	Tierney
Neugebauer	Ryan (OH)	Towns
Ney	Ryan (WI)	Turner
Northup	Ryun (KS)	Udall (CO)
Norwood	Sabo	Udall (NM)
Nunes	Salazar	Upton
Nussle	Sánchez, Linda	Van Hollen
Oberstar	T.	Velázquez
Obey	Sanchez, Loretta	Visclosky
Oliver	Sanders	Walden (OR)
Ortiz	Saxton	Walsh
Osborne	Schakowsky	Wamp
Otter	Schiff	Wasserman
Owens	Schwartz (PA)	Schultz
Oxley	Schwarz (MI)	Waters
Pallone	Scott (GA)	Watson
Pascarell	Scott (VA)	Watt
Pastor	Sensenbrenner	Waxman
Payne	Serrano	Weiner
Pearce	Shadegg	Weldon (FL)
Pelosi	Shaw	Weldon (PA)
Pence	Shays	Weller
Peterson (MN)	Sherman	Westmoreland
Peterson (PA)	Sherwood	Wexler
Petri	Shinkus	Whitfield
Pickering	Shuster	Wicker
Pitts	Simmons	Wilson (NM)
Platts	Simpson	Wilson (SC)
Poe	Skelton	Wolf
Pomboy	Slaughter	Woolsey
Porter	Smith (NJ)	Wu
Price (GA)	Smith (TX)	Wynn
	Smith (WA)	Young (AK)

NAYS—2

NOT VOTING—8

Flake	Paul	Sessions
Carter	Herseth	Young (FL)
Conaway	Lewis (GA)	
Deal (GA)	Murphy	

□ 1655

So (two thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF JUNETEENTH INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 160.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 160, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 425, nays 0, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 292]

YEAS—425

Abercrombie	Davis (IL)	Hunter
Ackerman	Davis (KY)	Hyde
Aderholt	Davis (TN)	Inglis (SC)
Akin	Davis, Jo Ann	Inslee
Alexander	Davis, Tom	Israel
Allen	DeFazio	Issa
Andrews	DeGette	Istook
Baca	Delahunt	Jackson (IL)
Bachus	DeLauro	Jackson-Lee
Baird	DeLay	(TX)
Baker	Dent	Jefferson
Baldwin	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jenkins
Barrett (SC)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jindal
Barrow	Dicks	Johnson (CT)
Bartlett (MD)	Dingell	Johnson (IL)
Barton (TX)	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Bass	Doolittle	Johnson, Sam
Bean	Doyle	Jones (NC)
Beauprez	Drake	Jones (OH)
Becerra	Dreier	Kanjorski
Berkley	Duncan	Kaptur
Berman	Edwards	Keller
Berry	Ehlers	Kelly
Biggert	Emanuel	Kennedy (MN)
Bilirakis	Emerson	Kennedy (RI)
Bishop (GA)	Engel	Kildee
Bishop (NY)	English (PA)	Kilpatrick (MI)
Bishop (UT)	Eshoo	Kind
Blackburn	Etheridge	King (IA)
Blumenauer	Evans	King (NY)
Blunt	Everett	Kingston
Boehlert	Farr	Kirk
Boehner	Fattah	Kline
Bonilla	Feeney	Knollenberg
Bonner	Ferguson	Kolbe
Bono	Filner	Kucinich
Boozman	Fitzpatrick	Kuhl (NY)
Boren	(PA)	LaHood
Boswell	Flake	Langevin
Boucher	Foley	Lantos
Boustany	Forbes	Larsen (WA)
Boyd	Ford	Larson (CT)
Bradley (NH)	Fortenberry	Latham
Brady (PA)	Fossella	LaTourette
Brady (TX)	Fox	Leach
Brown (OH)	Frank (MA)	Lee
Brown (SC)	Franks (AZ)	Levin
Brown, Corrine	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (CA)
Brown-Waite,	Gallely	Lewis (KY)
Ginny	Garrett (NJ)	Linder
Burgess	Gerlach	Lipinski
Burton (IN)	Gibbons	LoBiondo
Butterfield	Gilchrest	Lofgren, Zoe
Buyer	Gillmor	Lowe
Calvert	Gingrey	Lucas
Camp	Gohmert	Lungren, Daniel
Cannon	Gonzalez	E.
Cantor	Goode	Lynch
Capito	Goodlatte	Mack
Capps	Gordon	Maloney
Capuano	Granger	Manzullo
Cardin	Graves	Marchant
Cardoza	Green (WI)	Markey
Carnahan	Green (WI)	Marshall
Carson	Green, Al	Matheson
Case	Green, Gene	Matsui
Castle	Grijalva	McCarthy
Chabot	Gutierrez	McCaul (TX)
Chandler	Gutknecht	McCcollum (MN)
Chocola	Hall	McCotter
Cleaver	Harman	McCrery
Clyburn	Harris	McDermott
Coble	Hart	McGovern
Cole (OK)	Hastings (FL)	McHenry
Conyers	Hastings (WA)	McHugh
Cooper	Hayes	McIntyre
Costa	Hayworth	McKeon
Costello	Hefley	McKinney
Cox	Hensarling	McMorris
Cramer	Herger	McNulty
Crenshaw	Higgins	
Crowley	Hinchey	
Cubin	Hinojosa	
Cuellar	Hobson	
Culberson	Hoekstra	
Cummings	Holden	
	Holt	
	Honda	
	Hooley	
	Hostettler	
	Hoyer	
	Hulshof	

Miller (NC)	Regula	Spratt
Miller, Gary	Rehberg	Stark
Miller, George	Reichert	Stearns
Mollohan	Renzi	Strickland
Moore (KS)	Reyes	Stupak
Moore (WI)	Reynolds	Sullivan
Moran (KS)	Rogers (AL)	Sweeney
Moran (VA)	Rogers (KY)	Tancredo
Murtha	Rogers (MI)	Tanner
Musgrave	Rohrabacher	Tauscher
Myrick	Ros-Lehtinen	Taylor (MS)
Nadler	Ross	Taylor (NC)
Napolitano	Rothman	Terry
Neal (MA)	Roybal-Allard	Thomas
Neugebauer	Royce	Thompson (CA)
Ney	Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)
Northup	Rush	Thornberry
Norwood	Ryan (OH)	Tiahrt
Nunes	Ryan (WI)	Tiberi
Nussle	Ryun (KS)	Tierney
Oberstar	Sabo	Towns
Obey	Salazar	Turner
Olver	Sánchez, Linda	Udall (CO)
Ortiz	T.	Udall (NM)
Osborne	Sanchez,	Upton
Otter	Loretta	Van Hollen
Owens	Sanders	Velázquez
Oxley	Saxton	Visclosky
Pallone	Schakowsky	Walden (OR)
Pascarella	Schiff	Walsh
Pastor	Schwartz (PA)	Wamp
Paul	Schwarz (MI)	Wasserman
Payne	Scott (GA)	Schultz
Pearce	Scott (VA)	Waters
Pelosi	Sensenbrenner	Watson
Pence	Serrano	Watt
Peterson (MN)	Shadegg	Waxman
Peterson (PA)	Shaw	Weiner
Petri	Shays	Weldon (FL)
Pickering	Sherman	Weldon (PA)
Pitts	Sherwood	Weller
Platts	Shimkus	Westmoreland
Poe	Shuster	Wexler
Pombo	Simmons	Whitfield
Pomeroy	Simpson	Wicker
Porter	Skelton	Wilson (NM)
Price (GA)	Slaughter	Wilson (SC)
Price (NC)	Smith (NJ)	Wolf
Pryce (OH)	Smith (TX)	Woolsey
Putnam	Smith (WA)	Wu
Radanovich	Snyder	Wynn
Rahall	Sodrel	Young (AK)
Ramstad	Solis	
Rangel	Souder	

NOT VOTING—8

Carter	Herseth	Sessions
Conaway	Lewis (GA)	Young (FL)
Deal (GA)	Murphy	

□ 1705

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 21, 2005, I was unavoidably detained on official business in my Congressional District. During rollcall vote No. 288, if present, I would have voted "yea." On rollcall vote No. 289, I would have voted "no." On final passage of H.R. 2475, authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities, rollcall vote 290, I would have voted "yea." On passage of H.J. Res. 52, rollcall vote 291, I would have voted "yea." On passage of H. Con. Res. 160, rollcall vote 292, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, due to official business relating to the visit of BRAC Commissioner General Lloyd Newton to the 911th

Airlift Wing, Air Force Reserve in my Congressional District, I was not present in the Chamber on Tuesday, June 21, 2005, and was regrettably unable to cast my vote on rollcall No. 288, rollcall No. 289, rollcall No. 290, rollcall No. 291, and rollcall No. 292.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 288; "no" on rollcall No. 289; "yea" on rollcall No. 290; "yea" on rollcall No. 291; and "yea" on rollcall No. 292.

SUPPORTING FIREFIGHTER LIFE SAFETY SUMMIT INITIATIVES AND MISSION OF NATIONAL FALLEN FIREFIGHTERS FOUNDATION AND UNITED STATES FIRE ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 180.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 180.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H.R. 3010, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. REGULA, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-143) on the bill (H.R. 3010) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCAUL of Texas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

TAKING STEPS TO FIX NICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, currently, when someone wants to buy a gun, they are subject to a background

check, and once he or she is cleared, the records of that transaction are destroyed after 24 hours. But 24 hours is simply not enough time to ensure a gun is not sold to someone who should not be buying guns. Why? Because the National Instant Background Check System, or NICS, is not effective enough to warrant such a quick turnaround time on gun purchase records.

NICS is a database to check potential firearm buyers for any criminal record or history of mental illness.

□ 1715

Mr. Speaker, however, the NICS system is only as good as the information States provide. Twenty-five States have automated less than 60 percent of their felony convictions into the NICS system.

In these States, many felons will not be listed on the NICS system and would be able to purchase guns with no questions asked. In 13 States, domestic violence restraining orders are not accessible through the NICS system. Common sense would dictate that you do not sell a gun to someone who has been recently served with a restraining order.

Thirty-three States have not automated or do not share mental health records that would disqualify certain individuals from purchasing a gun under existing law. Also felony convictions in some States will not show up on another State's background check.

I understand the political realities of this Congress when it comes to new gun laws. Many on both sides of the aisle see anything longer than a 24-hour period to hold records as a de facto gun registry.

So we must take measures to fix the NICS system to make sure that our existing laws are enforced. I have introduced legislation with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the NICS Improvement Act of 2005, that will give States grants to update their NICS database.

This is the same bill that passed the House by a voice vote in the 107th Congress. No one person was denied his or her second amendment rights because of this bill. Even the National Rifle Association approved the bill in 2002.

It is the States' responsibility to make sure that NICS databases are in order. But if so many States are facing budget problems, many simply cannot afford to dedicate resources to updating their NICS system.

Meanwhile, too many criminals are slipping through the cracks of our background check system. This is unacceptable, especially in the post-9/11 era. Until we fix the NICS system, our law enforcement officers will continue to be within a tight deadline to determine whether or not background checks cover all of the bases.

With my bill, we can ensure that the NICS system does its job at the point of purchase. Mr. Speaker, please bring the NICS Improvement Act up for a vote this summer. It is time that we

close the legal loopholes that make it so easy for criminals to buy guns and so difficult for law enforcement agencies to keep us safe.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that can work. This is a bill that has bipartisan support. This is a bill that can save lives, especially those of our police officers.

BRING DOWN AMERICA'S DRUG PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCAUL of Texas). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise again tonight to talk about prescription drugs, and more importantly about what Americans pay for prescription drugs compared to consumers in other industrialized countries.

I have this chart, and I know that on television it is a little hard for the Members who are watching their offices to see these numbers, but if you go to my Web site at gil.house.gov, you can see this chart and other comparisons that we have, not only with the United States and Germany, as this chart is, but with other countries, because we now have pharmacists literally around the world who regularly share with us what their prices are for prescription drugs.

What you see here are 10 of the most commonly prescribed drugs in the United States. You can buy those drugs in Frankfurt, Germany for \$455.57. Those same 10 drugs here in the United States are \$1,040.04. Americans pay 128 percent more for the same drugs made in the same plants under the same FDA approval.

Let me give you one example we have talked about before: Zocor, an excellent drug. Many heart patients take Zocor. As a matter of fact, some of our colleagues here in Congress take Zocor. And depending on what Federal program you are under, you can be paying a copay of \$30 for that drug. Federal Members of Congress may be paying \$30 when consumers in Germany can walk into the Metropolitan Pharmacy in Frankfurt, Germany, and they can buy that drug for \$23.80.

The copay here in the United States, in many cases, is \$30. The regular price in Rochester, Minnesota, for that drug, \$85.39. And again, these are the same drugs, made in the same plants with the same FDA approval. What is wrong with this picture?

Well, what is wrong with this picture is that American consumers are held hostage. In countries like Germany, they have what is called parallel trade. So a pharmacist in Frankfurt, for example, if they want to buy that Zocor, if they can buy that Zocor in Sweden cheaper than they can buy it from the distributors in Germany, they are allowed to do that.

That creates a competitive marketplace. That is what we are trying to en-

courage with the Pharmaceutical Market Access Act. Now, our Founders understood that the Federal Government is created by the States and not the other way around.

But the States in many cases have been referred to as the laboratory of democracy. And the interesting thing is State governments, and more importantly the Governors of those States, are not standing by idly.

What they are doing is they are creating their own programs. In Illinois, in Kansas, in my own State of Minnesota, Minnesotans now have access to buying drugs from Canada, and they recently added Great Britain.

The I-SaveRx program, now in Illinois, includes Canada, the United Kingdom, and Ireland. Now, many of the people here in Washington, our own FDA says that is not safe. Well, some of these States have now over a year of experience and they have demonstrated that this can be done safely.

The list goes on. Missouri, Nevada, I think was just signed into law either yesterday or today, the law takes effect July 1st, so that people in Nevada will have access to drugs from foreign countries at much more competitive prices. New Hampshire, North Dakota has joined the list. We now have 11 States, and we do not know how many cities have joined this list.

But it really is time for us at the Federal level to do our job to make sure that Americans have access to world-class drugs at world-market prices. Mr. Speaker, this is not a mystery. It can be done. What we know is that the Europeans are not intrinsically smarter than we are.

If they figured out how to do this parallel trade, we can do it as well. Mr. Speaker, it is time for Americans to have access to these drugs at 128 percent cheaper than they can buy them in the United States.

BEST GOVERNMENT MONEY CAN BUY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, we often hear that the American people have a negative opinion of the job we do here in Congress. In fact, recent polling indicates that 53 percent of the country disapproves of the way Congress handles its job.

In a recent CNN poll, 71 percent of the American people said Congress fails to share their priorities and values. Some around here may wonder why that is. Could it be because while American families struggle to pay their education bills, their medical bills, save for their retirement, this Congress has come to be handing out special favors, and that is all they see of this Congress?

Could it be because ours has become a government of the special interests, for the special interests? Mr. Speaker,

when your gavel comes down, it is to open the people's House, not the auction house. What have the American people seen of late?

They have seen that when we had a tax bill problem of \$4 billion on the corporate side, we were trying to fix a \$4 billion problem, it ended up costing the taxpayers \$150 billion in special interest favors. Only in this Congress, only in this country could you stick the taxpayers with a \$150 billion bill to bail out corporate interests, when you were trying to fix only a \$4 billion problem.

And rather than creating jobs as the bill was intended, it is creatively named the Jobs Creation Bill, it was nothing more than a multi-billion dollar giveaway to special interests. Or consider last year's prescription drug bill for Medicare.

It is about an \$800 billion handout to the prescription drug industry after having been one of the largest contributors to the campaign committee, both for Democrats and Republicans; and it actually ended up with producing an additional \$153 billion in profits for the pharmaceutical industry.

While we were working on that legislation, a Member of this body was actually negotiating a job to go to work for that industry and represent it. Or now that we are talking about the energy bill, we are talking about a \$14 billion taxpayer giveaway to the energy industry, and oil is now being charged at \$59 a barrel.

If it is not profitable at \$59 a barrel, what more do we have to give them? Neither does it ever reduce our dependence on foreign oil. And the pundits here in Washington wonder why the American people out in the country do not like their Congress?

But it is not just the administration and their congressional allies that have worked to craft legislation benefiting a single industry. In some cases the special interests actually sit at the table drafting the legislation that impacts them.

For instance, recently we were all shocked to learn that Philip Cooney, the former chief of staff for the White House counsel on environmental quality and a former lobbyist at the American Petroleum Institute, consistently changed government reports on global warming.

After leaving the White House, and having been discovered having literally changed government reports on the impacts of global warming, where does he end up with a job? Exxon, a company opposed to any legislation on global warming. Then there is the tobacco lawsuit. The U.S. Government won its case handily against Big Tobacco; but rather than seeking the maximum penalty of \$130 billion, the government suddenly decided to only ask for \$10 billion where Philip Morris' attorney said they were very surprised at this decision.

Nobody seems to know how the decision was made, but in the past weeks it

has become clear that the associate attorney general, Robert McCalum, a former employee at a firm representing tobacco executives and industry, forced the government to reduce its own penalties to pennies on the dollar.

But if Americans are not turned off by the corporate goodies dished out by Congress, and if industry execs crafting the policies that benefit their own companies do not get them worked up, maybe it is the revolving door between the public and private sector.

As I mentioned, a colleague of ours went off to represent the prescription drug industry known as Big Pharma, after having passed an \$800 billion prescription drug bill.

And, by the way, the chairman of the health subcommittee dealing with the very same bill is now employed by other drug companies. Mr. Speaker, the American people are concerned that Congress does not reflect their priorities or their values. Sadly, they are right.

We have a government that has become beholden to the special interests; and their voices, the voices of the American people have been quieted by the voices of the special interests.

And as far as the government special interests are concerned, this is the best government money can buy. Mr. Speaker, the gavel marks the opening of the people's HOUSE, not the auction house. This election is about returning that gavel to its rightful owners, the American people.

The President and his advisors tout the fact that they do not pay attention to polling data. Well, maybe, it is time they did, because the message is loud and clear, the American people want their House back.

GUANTANAMO BAY AND THE KORAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, over the past week or 10 days, we have heard a lot of haranguing about what is going on down at the Guantanamo detention facility regarding the prisoners who were involved in terrorist activities and opposed our troops over in Iraq and elsewhere in the world.

And some people in the Congress have even equated what is going on down there with Hitler, Stalin, Pol Pot, and what happened in World War II and the concentration camps. And it is reprehensible that that comparison is even being thought about, let alone being expressed by one of my colleagues.

So I wanted to come tonight and give to the American people who may be paying attention back in their offices some facts about Guantanamo and what is going on down there.

Forgive me for reading this to you, but I think it is extremely important. I want to put everything in context.

Our men and women down there are serving with honor and dignity.

Since September 11, 2001, more than 70,000 detainees have been captured in the global war on terror in Afghanistan and in Iraq. Some 800 suspected members of al Qaeda or the Taliban have been sent to GITMO, no one under 18 years of age. Approximately 520 remain.

Approximately 235 have been released, transferred to other countries, and 61 are awaiting release or transfer right now. GITMO houses some of the most dangerous individuals linked to the most dangerous organizations in the world, all wishing harm to the United States of America and our citizens: terrorist trainers and financiers, would-be suicide bombers, bomb makers and Osama bin Laden's own personal body guard. One such terrorist currently being detained at GITMO is Mohammed Al-Khatani, believed to be the intended 20th hijacker that attacked the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and other areas back on 9/11.

Al-Khatani and his fellow murderers and criminals have provided valuable information at GITMO, including organizational structure of al Qaeda and other terrorist groups; the extent of terrorist presence in Europe, the U.S. and the Middle East; al Qaeda's pursuit of weapons of mass destruction; terrorist skill sets; general and specialized operative training; and how to legitimize financial activities that are used to hide terrorist operations.

Mr. Speaker, intelligence gained at Guantanamo has literally prevented terrorist attacks and saved possibly thousands, maybe hundreds of thousands, of American lives. U.S. misconduct versus detainee misconduct: there has been a lot of misinformation about that. After the much publicized and now retracted May 2005 Newsweek article alleging Koran abuse by the U.S. military officials, Brigadier General Jay Hood conducted an exhaustive investigation.

□ 1730

Brigadier General Hood's investigation determined some interesting findings which run contrary to the claims we are hearing about today. For instance, U.S. soldiers used latex gloves and clean towels while even handling the Koran. U.S. soldiers routinely must search detainees Korans when they refuse to show them for security searches. U.S. soldiers inspect for weapons by touching the Koran through surgical masks. Surgical masks are used to hang detainees' Korans during security searches. And when a guard accidentally knocked one of them off, it was fully investigated and deemed an accident.

An outside contractor stepped on a Koran during an interrogation. After an investigation was completed, the contractor apologized and was terminated because he accidentally stepped on the Koran.

On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, Brigadier General Hood's investigation

found the detainees themselves regularly displayed less regard for the Koran. For instance, on May 14, 2003, a guard observed a detainee ripping up his Koran in small pieces. July 5, 2003, a guard observed two detainees accuse a third of not being a man. In response, the detainee urinated on one of their Korans. January 19, 2005, four guards witnessed a detainee tear up his Koran and flush it down the toilet. January 23, 2005, four guards witnessed a detainee rip pages out of his Koran and throw them down the toilet. The detainee stated he did so because he wanted to be moved to another camp.

These detainees are trained to resist interrogation. The U.S. discovered a captured al Qaeda training manual, the Manchester document, that instructs members to allege abuse and mistreatment and torture if they are captured.

Mr. Speaker, it is also important to note that detainees are only sent to GITMO after a thorough screening process that identifies individuals who pose a threat to the United States of America or who have valuable intelligence information.

Combatant status review tribunals. All detainees have been reviewed by a tribunal. There is an administrative review board which reviews each case at least once annually for possible release based on the threat. More than 130 boards have been completed to date. Military commissions, trials with full and vigorous representation for those suspected of committing war crimes, awaiting resolution of various U.S. Federal court rulings and reviews.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I am out of time. There is more information that needs to be given to my colleagues and the American people. But we have treated those terrorists down there so well compared to the way they treat our people, beheading and everything that has gone on in Iraq and elsewhere in the world. Our troops are doing the humane main thing in accordance with the humanity of their fellow man, and they are treating those terrorists so much better than is being publicized in the press, and the American people have a right to know about it.

So let's talk about what is really going on at GTMO, where I want to stress, that the vast majority of our brave service men and women are serving with honor and dignity.

Since September 11, 2001, more than 70,000 detainees have been captured in the global war on terror in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Some 800 suspected members of Al Qaeda or the Taliban have been sent to GTMO (no one under 18 years old).

Approximately 520 remain; approximately 235 have been released/transferred to other countries; and, 61 are awaiting release or transfer.

GTMO houses some of the most dangerous individuals, linked to the most dangerous organizations in the world, all wishing to harm the U.S., including:

Terrorist trainers and financiers; would-be suicide bombers; bomb makers; and, Osama bin Laden's own bodyguards.

One such terrorist currently being detained at GTMO is Mohammed Al-Khatani, believed to be the intended 20th 9/11 hijacker.

Al-Khatani and his fellow murderers and criminals have provided valuable information, including:

Organization structure of Al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups; extent of terrorist presence in Europe, the U.S., and the middle east; Al-Qaeda's pursuit of WMD; terrorist skill sets; general and specialized operative training; and, how legitimate financial activities are used to hide terrorist operations.

Mr. Speaker, intelligence gained at Guantánamo has literally prevented terrorist attacks and saved American lives.

After the much publicized—and now retracted—May 2005 Newsweek article alleging Koran abuse by U.S. military officials, Brigadier General Jay Hood conducted an exhaustive investigation.

Brig. Gen. Hood's investigation determined some interesting findings, which run contrary to the claims we are hearing today. For instance:

U.S. soldiers used latex gloves and clean towels while handling the Koran—U.S. soldiers routinely must search detainee's Korans when they refuse to show them for security searches;

U.S. soldiers inspected for weapons by touching Koran through surgical mask—surgical masks are used to hang detainee's Korans during security searches. When a guard accidentally knocked one off it was fully investigated and deemed an accident.

An outside contractor stepped on a Koran during an interrogation—after an investigation was completed, the contractor apologized and was terminated.

On the contrary Mr. Speaker, Brig. Gen. Hood's investigation found that detainees themselves regularly displayed far less regard for the Koran, for instance:

May 14, 2003—A guard observed a detainee rip his Koran into small pieces.

June 5, 2003—A guard observed two detainees accuse a third of not being a man. In response, the detainee urinated on one of their Korans.

January 19, 2005—Four guards witnessed a detainee tear up his Koran and try to flush it down the toilet.

January 23, 2005—Four guards witnessed a detainee rip pages out of his Koran and throw them down the toilet. The detainee stated he did so because he wanted to be moved to another camp.

These detainees are trained to resist interrogation.

The U.S. discovered a "captured al Qaeda training manual"—the Manchester Document—that instructs members to allege abuse & torture if captured.

Mr. Speaker, it is also important to note that detainees are only sent to GTMO after a thorough screening process that identifies individuals who pose a threat to the U.S. or have valuable intelligence info.

Combatant status review tribunals—All detainees have been reviewed by a tribunal.

Administrative review boards—Review each case at least once annually for possible release based on threat. More than 130 boards completed to date.

Military Commissions—Trials with full and vigorous representation for those suspected of committing war crimes. *Awaiting resolution of

various U.S. Federal Court rulings and reviews.

The GTMO detention facility is transparent and has been fully scrutinized.

To set the record straight Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government has released more than 16,000 pages of documents regarding detainee operation, including classified interrogation techniques.

Since 2002, GTMO has provided granted access to the following:

International Red Cross—Had 24/7 access to the facility at its discretion and a permanent presence; Media—400 visits by 1,000 national and international journalists; 11 Senators, 77 Representatives, and 99 Congressional staff members; and, lawyers for detainees.

RENEGOTIATE CAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCAUL of Texas). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, 13 months ago the President of the United States signed the Central American Free Trade Agreement. The trade agreement is an agreement between the United States and six Latin American countries, five in Central America and the Dominican Republic. It has been 13 months, as I said, since the President signed this agreement.

The majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the most powerful Republican in the House, promised a vote in 2004. He promised a vote by Memorial Day. Now he promised a vote, I think he means it this time, by July 4.

It is simple, the reason we have not voted on the Central American Free Trade Agreement, and that is because of the broad opposition in this House and among the American people. Republicans and Democrats by the dozens in this House oppose the Central American Free Trade Agreement. Business organizations, labor unions, both in the United States and in the six Latin American countries, oppose the Central American Free Trade Agreement. The Latin American Council of Churches, as do many religious leaders and churches and organizations in the United States, oppose the Central American Free Trade Agreement. Environmentalists, active environmentalists, food safety advocates, all kinds of very broad-based organizations oppose the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and I did a news conference at the Capitol with 23 business leaders speaking out, business leaders representing 23 businesses speaking out against the Central American Free Trade Agreement. The reason is simply that our policy is not working. Our trade policy in this country has failed us for 12 years.

Just look at this chart. Since 1992, the year I was elected to Congress, the trade deficit, number of dollars' worth of exports versus imports, our trade

deficit internationally was \$38 billion. Today after NAFTA, PNTR, TPA, all these trade agreements, our trade deficit last year was \$618 billion. From \$38 billion to \$618 billion.

Now, maybe those are just numbers, but those numbers translate into something much more important than economist data. These numbers translate into manufacturing job losses. The States in red have lost 20 percent of their manufacturing in the last 5 years. The States in blue have lost 15 to 20 percent. Ohio, my State, 217,000 jobs lost; Michigan 210,000; Illinois 224,000. These are just manufacturing job losses. People who make a decent wage, a middle-class wage, who have health benefits, who have earned pensions, thousands, hundreds of thousands of them, have lost their jobs; 228,000 in North Carolina; 130,000 in Mississippi and Alabama; 353,000 in California; 201,000 in the State of Texas; 200,000 in the State of Pennsylvania; 72,000 in the State of Florida. In State after State after State, we are losing hundreds of thousands of manufacturing jobs.

Our the trade policy is not working. CAFTA is more of the same. CAFTA is a dysfunctional cousin of the North American Free Trade Agreement. It was an agreement that was negotiated by the select few, benefiting the select few.

Now, supporters of CAFTA tell us, as they always do in trade agreements, that as a result of this agreement U.S. companies will export more products to the developing world. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, if you look at this chart, that is simply not the case.

The U.S. typical average wage is \$38,000. The average wage in El Salvador is 4,800; Honduras 2,600; Nicaragua 2,300. To say that people in those countries are going to buy products made in this country simply does not pass the credibility test. Hondurans are not going to be able to buy cars made in Ohio. Nicaraguans making \$2,300 a year are not going to be able to buy prime beef raised in Nebraska. Guatemalans making \$4,100 a year are not going to be able to buy steel from Pennsylvania or apparel from North and South Carolina, or be able to buy software from Seattle.

Mr. Speaker, those 23 business organizations that spoke out against CAFTA today, labor unions in all seven countries, environmentalists, food safety advocates, small businesses, farmers and ranchers in all seven countries, in Latin America and in this country, are simply saying renegotiate CAFTA; come up with a different Central American Free Trade Agreement that will help all of us.

If we are going to protect prescription drugs, we should protect workers. If we are going to protect Hollywood films, as CAFTA does, we should protect the environment and food safety.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass a trade agreement that works for all of us in this country, not just a select few.

HUMANE TREATMENT FOR GITMO PRISONERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, it is about supper time here in the United States. I wonder what is on the plates across our dinner tables. Perhaps lemon baked fish, broccoli, steamed carrots, fresh fruit. Sounds healthy to me, maybe delicious to some. This menu could be on any menu of any home or restaurant in the United States tonight.

But, Mr. Speaker, this menu is also what is being served in Guantanamo Bay prison on any given night. Mr. Speaker, we have a purpose in Guantanamo Bay. It is to house outlaws, criminals, radical terrorists; they are locked up there.

These detainees are people that have killed Americans and want to keep killing Americans. These are people picked up off the battlefield. They were not wearing uniforms. They were not state sponsored, but there were there for a reason, and that was to execute innocent people on the battlefield.

The Geneva Convention, Mr. Speaker, protects those people who are at war, who have a chain of command. They wear a uniform. They do not have concealed weapons and they do not kill the innocents. Mr. Speaker, terrorists do just the opposite. They kill innocents. They have concealed weapons. They certainly do not wear uniforms, and there is no chain of command. They are not protected, Mr. Speaker, by the Geneva Convention.

International law allows any nation the right to detain any combatants for a conflict's duration to prevent them from killing and to gather further useful information. The detainees at Guantanamo are enemy combatants. They are there because they shot our troops. They were involved in terrorism. Any many of them have information that could prevent further attacks.

Some of them have been released. And at least 12 of them have been recaptured on the battlefield trying to kill Americans.

Ann Coulter describes the tactics at Guantanamo Bay in her latest article. She said, Interrogators there cannot yell at detainees. They cannot serve the detainees cold meals except in certain circumstances. Cannot poke the detainees in the chest or engage in any type of pushing without some type of monitor. And we cannot subject the detainees to temperatures changes, of all things.

Once a suspected terrorist gets to Guantanamo, they are not treated like the Nazis treated the Poles and the Jews in World War II. Those that compare the Nazi concentration camps to Guantanamo owe an apology to those people and those families that died in those concentration camps, and they owe an apology to the American troops.

My dad served in World War II. He helped liberate those concentration camps, and 50 years later I went to Dachau and saw what it was like. And Guantanamo Bay, to be compared to a Nazi concentration camp, it is a sham and it is shameful conduct.

We even know that some of the prisoners at Guantanamo Bay have actually gained weight while they have been there. Mr. Speaker, before I became a Member of Congress, I dealt with criminals all my life. First, as a prosecutor, as you did, and then as a criminal court judge for 22 years. I saw murderers, thieves and street terrorists. And they came through my court. And we sent them to jail. We sent them to Texas jails and Texas prisons. And, Mr. Speaker, those are jails, those are prisons where no one wants to go. That is what prison and jail is about.

So I invite those that criticize the activities in Guantanamo Bay to go there, go with me and see firsthand, before other outrageous statements are made about the conduct there.

So tomorrow night at Guantanamo Bay, orange glazed chicken, fresh fruit crepes, steamed peas, and mushrooms and rice pilaf. It does not sound like bread and water to me.

And do you think our troops and in Afghanistan and Iraq are getting crepes tonight? Probably not. They are eating C-rations out of cans as they stand there in the desert and the heat, protecting the world for democracy.

Those that say there is inhumane torture there in Guantanamo, let me say this: That dog just will not hunt.

We need to be more concerned about Americans being killed by terrorists in Iraq than we are about some terrorist that is locked up in Guantanamo Bay that gets a cold blueberry muffin.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFazio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AMTRAK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Once again in the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations, we see Amtrak being

treated like an ugly stepchild of this Nation's transportation system.

If we are wondering why only 19 percent of the American people feel that the Congress is in tune with their priorities, the cuts in Amtrak is one blatant reason why.

Yesterday we passed a \$408 billion defense appropriations bill, and it did not even include the costs of the war in Iraq. We are cutting Amtrak routes to local governments throughout the United States that have no other form of public transportation. We are spending \$1 billion a week in Iraq, \$4 billion a month, but this administration zeroes out funding for Amtrak, and the Committee on Appropriations does not even give them enough money to operate the Northeast corridor.

Just one week's investment in Iraq would significantly improve passenger rail for the entire country for an entire year. The current funding issue concerning Amtrak brings up a fundamental question as to where this Nation stands on public transportation. We have an opportunity to improve the system that serves our needs for passenger rail service, or we can let it fall apart and leave this country's travelers and businessmen with absolutely no alternative forms of public transportation.

□ 1745

Without the funding Amtrak needs to keep operating, we will soon see people that rely on Amtrak to get to work each day waiting for a train that is not coming.

We continue to subsidize highways and aviation; but when it comes to our passenger rail system, we refuse to provide the money Amtrak needs to survive.

This issue is much bigger than just transportation. This is about safety and national security. Not only should we be giving Amtrak the money it needs to continue to provide services; we should be providing security money to upgrade their tracks and improve safety and security measures in the entire rail system.

Once again, we see the Bush administration paying for its failed policies by cutting funds to vital public services and jeopardizing more American jobs.

It is time for this administration to step up to the plate and make a decision about Amtrak based on what is best for the traveling public, not what is best for the right wing of the Republican Party and the bean counters at OMB.

I represent central Florida, which depends on tourists for its economic survival. We need people to be able to get to the State and enjoy it. Ever since September 11, more and more people are turning from the airlines to Amtrak; and they deserve safe and dependable service.

This is just one example of Amtrak's impact on my State. Amtrak runs four long distance trains from Florida, employing 990 residents, with wages totaling over \$43 million, who purchased

over \$13 million in goods and services last year. They are doing the same thing in every State that they run in.

Some people think the solution to the problem is privatizing the system. If we privatize, we will see the same thing we saw when we deregulated the airline industry. Only the lucrative routes will be maintained and routes to rural locations will be expensive and few.

I was in New York shortly after September 11 when the plane leaving JFK airport crashed into the Bronx. I, along with many of my colleagues in both the House and Senate, took Amtrak back to Washington. I realized once again just how important Amtrak is to the American people and how important it is for the Nation to have alternative modes of transportation.

This is not about fiscal policy. This is about providing a safe and reliable public transportation system that the citizens of this country need and deserve.

I am asking all of my colleagues to join me and support the full funding of Amtrak.

INFORMATION THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCaul of Texas). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, last week H.J. Res. 55 was introduced. This resolution requires the President to develop and implement a plan for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq. The plan would be announced before December 31, 2005, with the withdrawal to commence no later than October 1, 2006.

The media and the opponents of this plan immediately and incorrectly claimed it would set a date certain for a total withdrawal. The resolution, hardly radical in nature, simply restates the policy announced by the administration. We have been told repeatedly that there will be no permanent occupation of Iraq and the management will be turned over to the Iraqis as soon as possible.

The resolution merely pressures the administration to be more precise in its stated goals and make plans to achieve them in a time frame that negates the perception we are involved in a permanent occupation of Iraq.

The sharpest criticism of this resolution is that it would, if implemented, give insurgents in Iraq information that is helpful to their cause and harmful to our troops. This is a reasonable concern, which we address by not setting a precise time for exiting Iraq. The critics, though, infer that the enemy should never have any hint as to our intentions.

Yet, as we prepared to invade Iraq, the administration generously informed the Iraqis exactly about our plans to use "shock and awe" military

force. With this information, many Iraqi fighters, anticipating immediate military defeat, disappeared into the slums and hills and survived to fight another day, which they have.

One could argue that this information made available to the enemy was clearly used against us. This argument used to criticize H.J. Res. 55, that it might reveal our intentions, is not automatically valid. It could just as easily be argued that conveying to the enemy that we do not plan an indefinite occupation, as is our stated policy, will save many American lives.

But what we convey or do not convey to the Iraqi people is not the most crucial issue. The more important issue is this. Do the American people deserve to know more about our goals: the length of time we expect to be in Iraq; how many more Americans are likely to be killed and wounded; will there be a military draft; what is the likelihood of lingering diseases that our veterans may suffer, remember Agent Orange and the Persian Gulf War syndrome; and how many more tax dollars are required to fight this war indefinitely?

The message insurgents do need to hear and believe is that we are serious when we say we have no desire for a permanent occupation of Iraq. We must stick to this policy announced by the administration.

A plausible argument can be made that the guerrillas are inspired by our presence in Iraq, which to them seems endless. Iraqi deaths, whether through direct U.S. military action, collateral damage, or Iraqis killing Iraqis, serve to inspire an even greater number of Iraqis to join the insurgency. Because we are in charge, justly or not, we are blamed for all the deaths.

Continuing to justify our presence in Iraq because we must punish those for 9/11 is disingenuous to say the least. We are sadly now at greater risk than before 9/11. We refuse to deal with our own borders while chastising the Syrians for not securing their borders with Iraq. An end game needs to be in place, and the American people deserve to know exactly what that plan is. They are the ones who must send their sons and daughters off to war and pay the bills when they come due.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

SMART SECURITY AND IRAQ WITHDRAWAL PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, our Constitution states that Members of Congress must be chosen by the people of the United States and Congress must represent the people of the United States. That means that we, as Members of Congress, need to listen and act when the people speak.

Well, the American people have spoken. The latest Gallup poll released last week indicates that the American people are ready for our military forces in Iraq to begin coming home.

Nearly 60 percent of Americans believe that the United States should bring home some or all of our troops from Iraq. Just as revealing, the Gallup poll showed that only 36 percent of Americans support maintaining our current troop levels in Iraq. This is the lowest level of support for the war since it began in March 2003.

The American people have stated loud and clear where they stand, and their numbers are increasing. They know that the only way to keep our sons and daughters from being killed in Iraq and the only way to end the death and destruction that occur there every single day is to start the process of bringing our troops home. Clearly, the American people are way ahead of Congress on this issue.

Unfortunately, the President of the United States is way behind on the issue of Iraq. We have asked the President to come up with a plan for ending the war. He has not; so we will.

Our efforts to come up with a plan began in January when I introduced legislation calling for the President to begin bringing our troops home. Thirty-five Members of Congress support this legislation.

We continued our effort on May 25 when I introduced an amendment to the defense authorization bill calling for the President to create a plan for Iraq; 128 Members of Congress, including five Republicans and one Independent, voted in favor of this sensible amendment.

It is clear that the United States must develop a smarter agenda, an agenda for Iraq, an agenda that will go beyond when we bring our troops home from Iraq.

It is more important that we have a plan for the future than a continued military occupation, because this 2-year war has left us disturbingly weakened, weakened against the true security threats we face here at home. Let us not forget that Osama bin Laden is still at large, and al Qaeda continues to recruit new members in Iraq and elsewhere.

Once we have a plan in place to end the war in Iraq, we can start the long process of securing the United States and Iraq for the future. We can accomplish this through SMART Security.

SMART Security, which has the support of 50 Members of Congress, is a Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism for the 21st Century, and it will help us address the threats we face as a Nation.

SMART Security will prevent acts of terrorism in countries like Iraq by addressing the root conditions which give rise to terrorism in the first place: poverty, despair, resource scarcity, and lack of educational opportunities.

SMART Security encourages the United States to work with other nations to address the most pressing global issues. SMART addresses global emergencies diplomatically, instead of by resorting to armed conflict.

Instead of maintaining a long-term military occupation of Iraq, our future efforts to help the Iraqi people must follow the SMART approach: humanitarian assistance, coordinated with our international allies to rebuild Iraq's war-torn physical and economic infrastructure.

That is what I mean when I talk about SMART Security. We can defend America by relying on the very best of American values, our commitment to peace and freedom, our compassion for the people of the world, and our capacity for multilateral leadership.

Mr. Speaker, we must follow a smart-er approach, and we must do this as we work to help the Iraqi people. That means implementing a plan to end the war in Iraq. I invite the President, all Americans, and all Members of Congress to join me in this effort.

MEDIA SPIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in this job, all of us are used to misinformation, lies and distortions and manipulation by the media. We refer to that as spin; but, Mr. Speaker, I never expected such spin to come from the no-spin zone of Bill O'Reilly.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday my staff confirmed that I was to do a television show with Mr. O'Reilly last evening. It was initially scheduled to be seven o'clock. I had a 5:15 meeting scheduled with the Secretary of Energy.

At some point in time yesterday morning, the O'Reilly show changed that appointment to 5:50. My 5:15 meeting was still in place. My staff was fully in touch with the O'Reilly show. We gave them the information, and I attended a very important meeting with Secretary of Energy Bodman in his office, a classified meeting, on the specific problems with the threats of the nuclear program and capabilities of the former Soviet states.

That meeting ran over, partly because the meeting was interrupted several times by important phone calls the Secretary had to make.

Following that meeting, which ended somewhere around 6:15, as my col-

leagues know, we had a series of six votes on the House floor.

Mr. O'Reilly proceeded to tell his national audience last night that I "snubbed" him; that I failed to call him; that I was inconsiderate; that I was rude.

Talk about spin, Mr. Speaker. So today, I sent a memo to Mr. O'Reilly explaining the facts, and I would remind Mr. O'Reilly that the Secretary of Energy and an important meeting on nuclear issues in the former Soviet States takes my top priority.

□ 1800

So do the six votes I had to pass last night on the defense appropriation bill for 2006.

Mr. O'Reilly, we do not need more spin. We need honesty and candor. You call for it every day. Now perhaps your staff is not providing the appropriate level of service to you.

Mr. Speaker, because I had some contacts from constituents and Members, I would put the summary of my statement to Mr. O'Reilly and the notes of my staff about their contact with Mr. O'Reilly's show into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

BILL O'REILLY, I have now witnessed the ultimate spin—from, of all people, you.

My scheduled taping last evening between 6-6:30 pm was pre-empted by a prolonged 5:15 pm meeting with the Secretary of Energy Sam Bodman regarding important National Security issues related to non-proliferation activities in the former Soviet states and by a series of 6 recorded votes on the Floor of the House that started at 6:30 pm and lasted until 7:15 pm.

Contrary to your spin, my staff did give notice to your staff of both conflicts and kept them informed of my status during the scheduled taping. In addition my staff offered for me to appear as soon as votes ended. Finally when I tried to personally reach you, your staff was not willing to provide my staff with a suitable number.

As much as I would have enjoyed returning to your show, my job as a Member of Congress and as Vice Chairman of both the House Armed Services Committee and Homeland Security Committee is to cast my recorded vote on issues that affect our nation, in this case, the 2006 Defense Appropriations bill and related amendments which will fund our troops through 2006.

I hope you understand these obligations and I apologize for any inconvenience this unanticipated series of events caused to you and your staff.

CURT WELDON.

As of Friday, O'Reilly was marked as tentative on the PR calendar and CW's calendar at 7:00 pm.

After I left on Friday the DOE meeting was set up for 5:15 pm.

At some point on Monday morning, O'Reilly was confirmed by PR and changed on their calendar to 5:50.

At 12:35 pm, I was notified of the change via e-mail from Kristina.

I spoke to Peter on the phone and asked if O'Reilly could be moved to later given Curt's 5:15 meeting. He informed me it couldn't but not to worry if Curt wasn't there right at 6:00.

The change was made to CW's calendar at 1:25 pm.

I spoke to Porter around 1:30 and informed him of Curt's schedule prior to O'Reilly (i.e. a meeting with the Sec. of DOE). I told him

Russ would be with him and gave him mine and Russ' numbers.

From 5:45-6:30 Porter called me looking for Curt and Russ. I informed him they were still in the classified meeting and I was not able to get in touch with him.

Around 6:15 I asked if they need to cancel—Porter said that wasn't an option.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE). Members are reminded to address their comments to the Chair.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as I raise this issue with my colleagues, first I want to acknowledge that I believe that there are a number of efforts trying to make their way through the House and Senate on immigration reform that really should give us an opportunity to have a degree of synergism to respond to the concerns of the American people.

I rise today because I just finished a hearing in the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims on the important topic of employer sanctions. It would seem we should have agreement that employers should be penalized when they engage in the hiring of undocumented aliens. But interestingly enough, there is not agreement. The business community is particularly sensitive to this, claiming they are not able to find enough workers to fill these jobs. Then, of course, I think the AFL-CIO has a meritorious argument that when you enforce employer sanctions, employers who are unscrupulous will then enforce them against innocent persons, some documented and some undocumented, by either massively firing them or punishing them with lower wages and bad working conditions.

Interestingly enough, those who are fired will go out the door and that unscrupulous employer will then find others who are more timid to fulfill those jobs and they themselves may be undocumented. There are many issues that cannot be handled piecemeal.

Let me share another thought that came up in the hearing. There is a basic pilot program that requires employers to provide certain documentation when they hire an individual. Interestingly enough, only a few of the employers around the Nation can participate. Why? Because we have not given the Department of Homeland Security enough dollars to work the program beyond it being a pilot program.

It was also brought to our attention that maybe we should look to those who make the fraudulent documents and find a way to weed them out.

What this Nation really needs is comprehensive immigration reform. And so

I offer to my colleagues the Save America Comprehensive Immigration Act of 2005. It is H.R. 2092. We call it the fix-it bill. There are many fine efforts going through the United States Congress. But what I think immigrants need is a bill that fixes some of the 1996 immigration reform effort.

So we start off by focusing on family-based immigration by increasing the allocation of family-based visas. In speaking to a group of IndoAmericans, it was sad to hear the complaint about not being able to have loved ones come to the United States simply for a visit or simply to visit relatives in the United States that are ill or having some event. I have heard that from many, many immigrant communities around America, many of them documented with status, but yet they cannot invite their relatives to visit.

Another issue is protection against processing delays. Many offices have had to deal with constituents of Members when they call the various centers that deal with immigration where they have lost paperwork or lost fingerprints, stopping the good flow of immigration.

This bill includes acquisition of citizenship for children born abroad and out of wedlock to a United States citizen father. It allows aunts, uncles or grandparents to adopt orphaned or abandoned children of the deceased relative so it does not leave in limbo children outside of the country who have a United States citizen father, or orphaned children here in the United States who do not have an immediate parent, a mother or father.

It provides earned access to legalization. We run away from the language of amnesty only because people give it just a bad name. But we give earned access to people who are hardworking and providing income and taxes to the United States. We realize that intelligence, meaning keeping the bad guys out, is important so we provide more resources for border security. And we understand the issues of OTMs, other than Mexicans, that are coming across the border, maybe some who may want to do us harm, and we want to build up security at the northern and southern border.

Employment-based immigration. We want to deal with the unfair immigration-related employment practices, and we have in this particular legislation protection for American jobs. We have in this legislation training of Americans and the ability for an employer to have to attest that they cannot find an American for this job before they can hire someone who is not a citizen of the United States of America.

We address the question of removal waivers. We address the question of diversity visas.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, we address the question of the violence against women who happen to be undocumented. This is a comprehensive approach to the broken immigration system. I for one look forward to work-

ing with my colleagues and to give a hearing to all of the immigration bills that bring together the various thought processes of this Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike. Until we open the door to listening to all of us who have these ideas, we are not going to move immigration reform along.

I call on the chairmen and ranking members of our respective hearings to call for hearings in the House and the Senate on this important legislation and the legislation of my colleagues so we can finally answer the concerns of the American people.

REMEMBERING THE HON. JAKE PICKLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Texas and our Nation has lost one of its most genuine and gracious public servants. Last Saturday morning, James Jarell Pickle, "Jake," passed away on Saturday, with his wife by his side. For 31 years, Congressman Jake Pickle represented my hometown in this esteemed body as a Representative to the 10th Congressional District of Texas. And he did so with integrity, humility, honor, and a sense of humor that we should all attempt to mirror.

As a current holder of Congressman Pickle's seat, I work hard every day to provide the same kind of service to my constituents that Jake Pickle did to those he served. He was not just good at what he did, he was the best.

His family talks about the proudest vote he ever cast was in 1964 when he voted for the Civil Rights Act. He was one of only six southern Representatives to vote for that important piece of legislation. In the 1980s, he worked hours on end to protect Social Security and keep it solvent. He worked even harder in the 1990s to turn Austin into the high-tech society that it is today.

It is because of Jake Pickle that Austin continues to see new high-tech businesses locate to Texas's capital city. The University of Texas has also benefited greatly because of Jake Pickle. UT would not be churning out the latest in technology and new patents, as it now does every year, without the help that Congressman Pickle provided. It is also my honor to represent the research arm of the University of Texas which bears the name J.J. Pickle Research Campus.

But even as good and as smart a politician as he was, he is known today not for his ability to influence legislation or to help bring new business to his district, but rather for being a good and decent man. It is for this reason his nickname was Gentleman Jake. This gentleman served in the Navy during World War II, and worked his way through college by delivering milk to Austin homeowners. During his first congressional campaign and every time

after when he was out in public, he was shaking the hands of those he served. He enjoyed hearing about their lives and telling stories about his. He listened to their problems and sometimes used his own money to fix whatever problems they were having.

Representative Jake Pickle was a good man who will be terribly missed by all who knew him.

So tonight as I stand in the well of this esteemed body, a place so loved and respected by Jake, I am comforted in the thought that the Lord above is thankful to have this great servant back home in heaven where I am sure he is telling stories and shaking the hands of everyone that he meets.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2985, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-144) on the resolution (H. Res. 334) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2985) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEFEAT CENTRAL AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we have coming before us pretty soon an issue called CAFTA, the Central America Free Trade Agreement. I want to start my comments, Ross Perot, when he was a candidate for the Presidency on October 19, 1992 at a Presidential debate said, "You implement that the NAFTA, the Mexican trade agreement where they pay people a dollar an hour, have no health care, no retirement, no pollution controls, and you are going to hear a giant sucking sound of jobs being pulled out of this country right at a time when we need the tax base to pay the debt."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Perot was exactly right. We know Ross Perot as a successful businessman and a man who loves and cares about America.

Let me tell Members what happened since December 1993 when NAFTA became the law of the land. Before NAFTA, we ran a trade surplus with Mexico. Now the U.S. runs a \$45 billion annual trade deficit with Mexico; from a trade surplus to a trade deficit.

In addition, my home State of North Carolina since NAFTA became the law of the land has lost over 200,000 manufacturing jobs. The United States has lost over 2.5 million manufacturing jobs.

Let me give some facts about illegal aliens coming from Mexico across the

border. Prior to NAFTA, the average was 2 million. Since NAFTA, it is better than 7.5 million. CAFTA will continue these trends. Eighty-five percent of the language in CAFTA is identical to the language in NAFTA.

Let me give another example of what has happened to American jobs. In 2002, the Congress, I did not support this legislation, decided to give the President trade promotion authority, known as TPA. Since that time, America's annual trade deficit grew \$195 billion to \$617 billion. That is how much the trade deficit grew.

Let me give an example of TPA and how it relates to North Carolina. Since TPA passed, North Carolina has lost over 52,000 manufacturing jobs. The United States has lost over 600,000 manufacturing jobs.

□ 1815

Mr. Speaker, on my left I have got two news articles, one from a couple of years ago in the Raleigh paper known as the News & Observer; it says, Pillowtex Goes Bust, erasing 6,450 jobs. These were five plants in North Carolina that lost that many jobs, 6,450. Then I have got another article from a business in my county I share with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD), the Wilson Daily Times, says VF Jeanswear Closes Plants, Last 445 Jobs Gone By Next Summer. The jobs are going down to Honduras.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of more points. CAFTA means more U.S. job losses. We know what NAFTA has done. We know what Trade Promotion Authority, TPA, has done. CAFTA provides every incentive to outsource jobs to Central America. Average wages in Nicaragua are 95 cents an hour; Guatemala, \$1 an hour; El Salvador, \$1.25 an hour. Plus, these countries have few labor and environmental standards and CAFTA does little to improve them.

CAFTA will allow the Chinese to backdoor fabrics into Central America where it can be assembled and shipped into United States duty-free. The last thing we need is to help China. We have already outsourced 1.5 million jobs to China in the last 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, as I begin to close, I want to show my fellow colleagues that might be watching in their offices, recently this was dropped by my office, and it says candy decorated fruit snacks, real fruit. Then you turn it over and it says, "made in China." If the candy we are eating now in America, many of it is made in China, then I wonder if one day at the rate we are going of losing these manufacturing jobs, that we might be buying our tanks for our military from China.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that does not happen. I hope the House will defeat CAFTA. It is not good for America, it is not good for the American worker, and I do not even believe it is good for the people who live in Central America.

Mr. Speaker, with that I will close by asking God to please bless our men and

women in uniform and their families and ask God to please continue to bless America.

THE BUDGET DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCAUL of Texas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, this is not the first nor will it be the last time that we take the floor of the House here in the well of the House to address a problem that is of great concern to all of us, and that is the budget deficit. This year past, it was \$412 billion and while it appears to be improving, thankfully, a bit for the current fiscal year, it still will come in likely in the range of \$350 billion, and that will make it the third-largest deficit in our Nation's history, the third in a row where we have approached the pinnacle, the largest deficits we have run in our country's history.

We are not here to score political points. We are here to call attention to a problem that we think has grave consequences. It may be that we do not feel or see the consequences right now, but we feel that a day of reckoning lies on or just over the horizon. I believe that, because sooner or later the fundamentals in any market begin to take hold. It happened to the dot coms; it could happen again to us with the budget deficit that we are running today and the trade deficit we are running also today. It could hammer the dollar. After all, the fundamental is, simply stated, like this. When you raise the demand for credit, which is what you do when the government runs a deficit of \$312 billion, \$412 billion, when you raise the demand for credit, eventually you raise the price of credit. In other words, you raise interest rates. What do interest rates do when they go up? They stifle growth in the economy, long-term growth and short-term growth. They could have devastating consequences, for example, on the housing market, on the automobile market. That is a likely consequence of the policies we are running today.

For the time being, we have not felt or seen the results, the consequences, and largely that is due to the fact that this country is running large current account deficits, which means we are pumping dollars into the world economy which come back here, are recycled here by the purchase of our Treasury bonds and Treasury notes. So for now, foreigners are lending us the money to bridge our budget, which is sparing us the effect of high interest rates.

But at the same time, debt means dependence, and over the course of years if we continue this practice, we will find ourselves having undercut our independence in foreign policy which is something none of us wants. Even when

foreigners buy our debt and spare us the outlay for now, we still have to pay the interest. We still have debt service. The debt service in the total budget this past year was \$165 billion, \$170 billion, and it is going up inexorably because we have got more debt, and interest rates are rising again. As those two factors converge, you are going to see the debt service, the interest we pay on the national debt, go up to \$200 billion, \$225 billion, \$250 billion within the foreseeable future. This is an obligation that has to be paid. Indeed, there is no other item in the budget that is more obligatory. The United States of America has to pay its interest on its national debt or otherwise our currency and our credit would collapse. But once we pay the debt, once we pay the debt service, the effects are that priorities in the budget we could otherwise afford and fund and increase, such as medical research and scientific research and education for our children and Social Security and Medicare for the elderly become all the harder to fund because the interest has to be paid first.

This deficit problem is all the more distressing because it did not have to be. Just a few short years ago in the year 2000, the last full fiscal year of the Clinton administration, this country was running a surplus of \$236 billion. It is a fact. You can look it up. Every year the Clinton administration was in office due to two budget plans we adopted, one in 1993, another in 1997, the bottom line of the budget got better and better and better.

The President came to office and inherited a deficit of \$290 billion. He sent us on February 17 a deficit reduction plan that barely passed the House, a one-vote margin, barely passed the Senate, the Vice President's tie-breaking vote.

But look what happened, as this chart here shows. The deficit every year came down and down and down to the point where in the year 2000, we had a surplus, without including Social Security, a unified surplus of \$236 billion. Unprecedented. This was the surplus that President Bush inherited when he came to office in the year 2001. And that is why I say this did not have to be. We did not just fall out of the sky with these enormous deficits. We did it because of policies that were adopted and passed in this House. Not by all of us. Most of us on our side of the aisle voted against them. Foreseeing this problem and knowing how difficult it had been to move the budget finally back into the black again for the first time in 30, 40 years, we did not want to see us backslide into deficit, but that is exactly what happened.

What we have seen now is that we have gone from a surplus, projected, of \$5.6 trillion between 2002 and 2011. That was the 10-year projection that Mr. Bush's own economists made at the Office of Management and Budget when he took office, \$5.6 trillion. We have gone from a projected surplus of \$5.6

trillion to a projected deficit of \$3.8 trillion over that same 10-year period of time. That is a swing of \$9.4 trillion in the wrong direction. We have never seen a fiscal reversal like this, at least since the Great Depression, \$9.4 trillion in the wrong direction, and much of that was policy driven.

The President says we have got to get our hands around spending, but a large part of this problem was driven by his insistence that we have unprecedentedly large tax cuts, and when the surpluses that we thought were going to obtain over that 10-year period of time appeared to be overstated substantially, by some estimates as much as 50 percent, the President charged ahead with his tax cuts. In 2002, 2003, in addition to 2001, there were substantial tax cuts, and the loss of revenues has had a big impact on the bottom line and has helped put the deficit almost intractably in the red again.

But most of the spending increases have come on the discretionary side of the budget in the appropriation bills that we adopt every year in four different accounts, four different programmatic areas, which is important to know, because all of these areas are areas where the President has sought and we have provided what he has sought in the way of additional increases in spending.

If you look at the increases in spending over and above current services, and that is the amount of money necessary to maintain the government services at their existing level, if you look at those spikes in the budget that rise above funding for current services alone, you will find the landscape for 4 years dotted by the same increases, namely, defense, homeland security, the response to 9/11, they account for 90 to 95 percent of the increases in spending.

So, while the President is saying that Congress needs to tighten spending, in truth much of the spending that has driven the budget into deficit is spending that has been called for for defense and homeland security and for the response to 9/11, called for by the President, passed by the Congress, and the fact of the matter is we are simply not paying the tab for these necessary expenses.

I am not disputing the need for this money. What I am disputing and calling attention to is the fact that we are taking the tab for defense in our time against terrorists in the Middle East and elsewhere and shoving this tab off onto our children.

That is why I often say that the deficit is a problem for the economy because eventually it will raise interest rates and stifle long-term growth, eventually it will affect the priorities in the budget because debt service is obligatory and has to be paid; and as debt service increases, other things get eclipsed and shoved aside. But the biggest problem with the deficit in my book is moral, because what we are

doing is instead of paying for defense in our time, we are telling our children they have got to pay for defense in their time and our time, too, or at least the incremental cost of it.

This is the concern that we would like to address tonight, the fact that we are not facing up to the situation that confronts us and the fact that we have a budget deficit of enormous proportions and by any honest, fair, and accurate calculation or projection of what it is likely to be, it shows little signs of abating over the next 10 years, as this particular chart right here will show.

This chart shows where we believe, using Congressional Budget Office numbers, the President's budget, if implemented over the next 10 years, will take us. The budget deficit will get a bit better, as indeed it is scheduled to improve this year, probably \$350 billion. Good news. The bad news is that the President in projecting the future course of the deficit, number one, is only giving us a 5-year projection; and, number two, he has left out some significant costs, such as the cost of maintaining troops in Afghanistan and Iraq after the year 2005, such as the cost of fixing Social Security, such as the cost of repairing something we call the alternative minimum tax, which actually raises tax revenues above the level that would otherwise exist if people were not required to pay this alternative minimum tax. It will soon, by 2010, affect 30 million tax filers as opposed to 4 million this year.

I do not think politically that is likely to happen, and if you fix it to avert that problem, the problem of having the alternative minimum tax apply to middle-income families, for whom it was never intended, then you get a result here of a deficit, 10 years from now, equal to \$621 billion. No improvement; and indeed after a few years of slight moderation, a worsening deficit every year to the point where at the end of our 10-year time frame, it is up to \$621 billion.

Let me just wrap up this introductory presentation of what concerns us about the budget by showing you sort of the back-of-an-envelope, the easiest way I know to explain what I think is an out-of-control situation. Back in 2001 when the Bush administration was pushing its tax cuts, they came to us and they said, The future looks so rosy that you can pass these tax cuts, you can pass these defense increases, you can pass our budget, and we won't be back to ask you to increase the debt ceiling of the United States, a legal limit beyond which we cannot borrow. We won't be back until 2008, 2010.

Well, the Republicans in the House and the Republicans in the Senate passed the President's budget pretty much as he requested, with a few moderations. The next year they were back, hat in hand. 2002, notwithstanding what they told us the previous year, they needed an increase in the debt ceiling of the United States of

\$450 billion. The following year, 2003, they were back again. This time they wanted a phenomenal increase in the debt ceiling of the United States, \$984 billion, an increase in 1 year of \$984 billion. How much is that? That amount is equal to the entire debt of the United States the year that Ronald Reagan took office. It is a bit more than that, as a matter of fact. The following year, having obtained a \$984 billion increase on May 26, 2003, the following September, 2004, Secretary Snow was back saying, I need \$800 billion more.

□ 1830

They ran through \$984 billion of debt ceiling in 1 fiscal year and came back hat in hand and asked for \$800 billion more, which the Congress passed in late November of last year. And then when the budget resolution was brought to the floor this year, the Republican budget resolution, when it passed the House and passed the Senate, buried in it was a provision that called for another increase in the debt ceiling of \$781 billion.

This is a budget which they claim will eventually move us to halving the deficit over 5 years. At the same time they make that claim, they bury in that budget a request provision that Congress increase the debt ceiling by \$781 billion. Add those together, 4 fiscal years, we get an increase in the deficit, an increase in the national debt of \$3.015 trillion. That is just phenomenal.

There it is on the back of an envelope. It sums up the fiscal course and policy of this administration as succinctly as anything we can present: \$3 trillion of additional debt-borrowing capacity, which will basically all be used up by the end of this fiscal year, and they will be back again asking for more.

So this is what concerns us. We frankly do not think the country can continue on this course. And that is why we are here tonight to talk about a problem that we think should be a front-burner problem for both parties, both Houses, both executive branch and the Congress. It needs more attention than it is now receiving.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for organizing this event to talk about the Federal deficit and the Federal debt. And the chart he has up there is really significant.

What our Republican friends are doing, if we look at what they do and not what they say, they have decided that the most important thing in this country is to increase payments for interest on the national debt. It makes no sense, but that is what they are doing. And let me give a couple of numbers. In 2004, the Federal Government paid \$160 billion for net interest on the Federal debt held by public investors. By 2010, we will be spending about \$312 billion, almost double the \$160 billion that we spent last year.

So it is pretty clear when we look at the chart in front of us here today that over the next 6 years education spending will not go up much at all, environmental spending will be about the same, spending on veterans benefits will go up slightly; but there is an explosion in interest on the national debt. So the Republicans in this House are basically saying we are not spending enough on interest on the national debt. The trouble with that is that it is of virtually no use, virtually no use to any of us.

Think about the contrast between fiscal year 2005, which we are in, and fiscal year 2006, the coming year. There is an increase in spending on interest on the national debt of \$36 billion. That is with a "B." Thirty-six billion dollars, that is what we will spend on interest in the national debt next year more than we have spent this year.

And then let us look at what we are doing. This year how much is the increase that the Department of Education is getting from Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education bill? \$118 million. That is the increase in the bill, a tiny increase. Far less than 1 percent. \$36 billion more this coming year for interest on the national debt, \$118 million more for education. Those priorities are completely out of whack.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the chart we have here shows graphically exactly what the gentleman is saying, namely, interest just a bit over \$150 billion in 2004, the last fiscal year; but by 2010 if the Bush policies are completely implemented over the next 6 years, look what happens to debt service. That big rising red spike goes from \$150 billion to over \$300 billion, and it eclipses everything else in the budget.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, just one more point here. I think we have a moral obligation to our children that can be easily summarized: number one, protect them from harm. And that is what governments at all levels do, try to do, and that is what a lot of social service agencies try to do, protect our children from harm.

Number two, we need to give them a healthy start in life. We have to provide them with quality health care. Number three, we have to create opportunity for them, and that means investing in education, giving them a chance to succeed in life.

So as I said before, \$36 billion more is what the Republicans in the House want to spend on interest on the national debt. But they are cutting the Maternal and Child Health block grant by \$24 million, or 3 percent. They are failing to raise the maximum Pell grant by even \$100. They are doing that by only \$50. The bill is making a 5 percent cut in the Healthy Start Initiative, which makes targeted grants to

improve prenatal and infant care in areas with high infant mortality rates.

So in those areas with high infant mortality rates, we are just saying we are going to take money away from those parents and their kids. We are going to take it away because we have to pay interest on the national debt. They are freezing money for the child care block grant at last year's level. They are freezing after-school health care funds. It goes on and on. It is just an abomination.

To do what we are doing in this budget to our children, cutting their health care funds, decreasing opportunity, simply so we can pay for tax cuts and a war in Iraq is beyond belief, and we need to reverse it.

I want to thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for letting me go at this moment in the proceeding. And I am very grateful for all the work the gentleman from South Carolina is doing.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maine for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I just want to point out some of the things that he did not mention in his presentation, and using this same chart. Could he explain what PAYGO means?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, PAYGO is shorthand for a rule we adopted in 1991 and helped us achieve the phenomenal fiscal results I just showed the Members, where every year from 1993 to the year 2000, we had a better bottom line and a surplus of \$236 billion in the year 2000. PAYGO simply provides that if we want to have a tax cut when we have got a deficit, it has to be deficit neutral. That is to say the tax cut must be offset by a tax increase somewhere else within the Tax Code, or we must go to an entitlement program, which is permanent spending, and cut it enough to offset the loss of revenues. By the same token, if we want to increase or improve a new entitlement, we have to identify a revenue stream or other entitlement cuts to pay for it. It has to be, bottom line, deficit neutral.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. And if the gentleman will continue to yield, as a result of that fiscal responsibility and the tough votes that we cast, we were able to eliminate the deficit and go into surplus, a \$236 billion surplus.

What we are looking at now is it does not get any better. After we have gotten back into the ditch, it does not get any better.

Could the gentleman explain what this blue line up here is?

Mr. SPRATT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the blue line, believe it or not, is the path the Bush administration plotted when it was trying to sell its initial budget, its tax cuts, its de-

fense increases, to the Congress of the United States. They said even with these policies, this is the budget we foresee. This is the bottom line that we foresee between 2005 and 2011.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. And, Mr. Speaker, just a few years later, look at where we are. The President, down in the ditch where we are now, has promised to reduce the deficit 50 percent. First of all, how modest a goal is that from someone who inherited a \$5 trillion surplus to say that he is going to clean up half the mess that he has caused? Is that a realistic goal? Is that a fair goal to be judged by?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I do not think, given his budget policies, it is a realistic statement of what is likely to happen. One can call it a goal if they will, but I do not think it is a goal that is likely to be achieved under the policies that are now being furthered by this administration.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in other words, what the gentleman is saying is that he started with a surplus; he is now in a deficit, only promises to eliminate half the deficit; and he probably will not even be able to do that.

Mr. SPRATT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is holding a chart there that indicates the likely path that we think the budget will follow if we factor everything into it that is politically realistic: a fix in Social Security, a fix to the alternative minimum tax, and some reasonable provision for maintaining troops in Afghanistan and Iraq after 2005.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, if we run up deficits, we have to pay interest on the national debt. And we had a \$5 trillion surplus projected. Now we have over \$3 trillion in deficits. The interest that we are going to pay goes up. By 2010, according to this chart, where the interest we were going to pay was going down and the interest we have got to pay is going up, by 2010 the increase in interest is over \$230 billion, and that is \$230 billion that we are going to have to pay for interest on the national debt going down the drain that we are not going to be able to spend on public broadcasting; NASA Langley Research, in my area, aeronautics research.

We are closing bases. We are only going to save a few billion dollars in base closings, certainly not \$230 billion that we are going to have to spend in interest payments. We are closing bases, and the highest estimate I have seen over the course of time is about \$40 billion that we may save. \$230 billion and growing interest on the national debt. We are cutting back on ship building. We do not have the ship building budget that we ought to have. Cops on the beat being cut. Education programs, Pell grants. Ask somebody who is going to college how much tuition went up: 5, 10, 15 percent. Pell grants are going up 1 percent under this budget.

And it is getting worse before it gets better because, as we look at the interest on the national debt that we are going to be paying going on and the cost of these tax cuts exploding, the gentleman indicated that we only had a 5-year budget, and when we look at the cost of the tax cuts after 5 years, we can see why they did not want to reveal a 10-year budget. But this shows the exploding cost of the tax cuts going out to 2015.

What it does not show is the Social Security trust fund changing from a surplus, going into a deficit in 2018. That is when we have to be best prepared financially to be able to withstand the difference in the \$100 billion surplus we are getting out of Social Security going into a growing deficit. And we are going into that change in our worst possible fiscal situation.

Finally, when we put all these tax cut proposals into perspective, we see that the cost of making the tax cuts permanent, about \$12 billion is a lot more than the Social Security shortfall. In fact, the tax cuts for the top 1 percent is almost enough to cover the entire Social Security shortfall. So we cannot separate the tax cut policy from the spending priorities that we are going to have to address.

When we talk about public broadcasting, education, ship building, base closings, aeronautics research in my area, cops on the beat, education, this budget includes requirements to cut school lunches and student loans because we are funding tax cuts for the wealthy. There is even one tax cut that is going into effect in the next couple of years, the PEP and Pease, Personal Exemption Phase-out, and the Pease tax, which the President wants to repeal, that is about \$10 billion a year when the President finally gets his way to repeal those provisions.

\$10 billion a year and 97 percent of that money goes to those making \$200,000 or more. Almost half of it goes to about the top one-fifth of 1 percent. Those making \$1 million or more, about half of the benefit of that goes to that group, and we are cutting taxes approximately \$10 billion a year when it is fully phased in and at the same time cutting school lunches and student loans. How moral a decision is that to make?

So I would thank the gentleman for his answers. And also we have a chart up here saying what the promises were as we went along, as we went into skyrocketing deficits. We were first told that we could do tax cuts without budget deficits and then the next year our budget will run a little deficit, but it will be short term, then our current deficit is not large; and now he is promising maybe to clean up half of it.

When we run up that kind of debt, and the gentleman has a chart right at his feet, who owns the debt and what is the pattern there? Could the gentleman explain that chart?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I said earlier that one

reason we do not have the sort of moral outrage in the country about the deficit, that people are concerned about it but they do not quite feel and see it, this is the reason why.

□ 1845

Foreigners have been buying our debt in copious quantities, relieving us of, for now, the outlay that we would have to make, digging out of our own capital and our own savings, they are picking it up, for now. But what this means is that over time, debt means dependence, and we are incurring dependence to our debtors, and this has happened increasingly since the year 2000.

In the year 2000, foreigners held 30 percent of our Federal debt. Today, at least at the end of the last fiscal year, that had risen by 50 percent, almost 50 percent, or 44 percent; almost half of our debt is held today by foreigners, and that is a matter of some concern. It has to be one of the reasons that we do not need to be running persistent, perennial, huge deficits.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership. Just one final question. We have complained about how bad a situation we have gotten into, how much work we did to eliminate the deficit, running into surplus. Does the gentleman from South Carolina have a plan to get us back on track?

Mr. SPRATT. We did. We offered it on the House floor this past budget season, and we will put it up again. As my colleagues will see, it involves foregoing some of the tax cuts that the Bush administration has pushed through Congress, primarily for the reason that the projections upon which those tax cuts were based have not been obtained, they have not come about, they are a fraction of what was forecasted and expected.

So, we have to adjust our budget, our taxes, back to fiscal reality. If we do that, by the year 2010, 2012, we are back in the black again. But it is a big decision. It is a big decision. It can be done, and that was one of the purposes of our budget presentation, was to show that it can be done. We can argue about how to do it, but it is certainly feasible.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia, and I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for having this Special Order and for giving us an opportunity to talk to the American people about what is happening in our country.

Mr. Speaker, on February 17, 2004, the national debt of the United States of America exceeded \$7 trillion for the first time in our Nation's history. Sixteen months later, our national debt now stands at \$7.8 trillion. In that time, our country has added \$800 billion to our national debt, which I believe is unconscionable.

Two months ago, this House approved an increase of \$781 billion in the statutory debt limit, raising that figure to a record \$9 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, enough.

The out-of-control rise in the national debt over the last year and the rise in our debt demonstrated in the fiscal year 06 budget resolution conference reports are further signs of the dangerous position I think in which we find our country and our future. In 2001, this country had 10-year projected surpluses of \$5.6 trillion, and now we have likely 10-year deficits of, deficits instead of surpluses, of \$3.8 trillion. That is a \$9.4 trillion reversal.

Whether intentional or otherwise, our country's current fiscal policies are depriving the Federal Government of future revenues at a time when unprecedented numbers of people are going to start to retire, the baby boomers, and that is going to put a tremendous strain, a tremendous strain on our country and our ability to pay for Social Security and Medicare.

Our current fiscal irresponsibility is going to land squarely on the shoulders of our children.

Mr. Speaker, we talk so much here in Washington, D.C. and in Congress about values, and I say to my colleagues, putting our children deeper and deeper and deeper in debt is not a family value. My dad taught me when I was a little kid that you should live within your means, live within a budget, and do not spend more money than you have, and I think that truly is a value that we should teach our children. It is truly a value that we should follow here in Congress for our country. Because if we put our country and our children and grandchildren in a hole so deep we will never be able to climb out, we will not have done them any favors, and I think we will have committed an immoral act on them.

A true measure of values is not always what people say; it is where people decide they are going to spend their money. Congress is all about setting priorities, and part of the priorities, if we decide the priorities in this country are going to be more tax cuts, the permanent elimination of the estate tax is going to cost \$280 billion over 10 years, as opposed to raising the credit to \$3.5 billion, or \$3.5 million, which is only going to cost \$80 billion over 10 years; \$80 billion versus \$280 billion over 10 years. If we decide that is what is important, then we are going to have to make cuts in other domestic spending, such as children nutrition programs or not funding No Child Left Behind, which we shortchanged \$9 billion the first year it was implemented, and other important domestic programs.

I think values need to be discussed in real terms and we need to understand that again, a true measure of values is where we decide we are going to spend our money. If tax cuts are the most important thing for us, then that is the way it is going to be. But if we decide other things are important to us, children's nutrition programs, education,

and all the other domestic programs, then we need to make those decisions.

I thank the gentleman for providing the time this evening.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentleman and yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding. I want to take a little bit different tack, because I think our audience has heard a blizzard of numbers and sometimes it is hard to take in all that data at one time.

This chart shows right here a few dates on our calendar. One date is the year 2004, last year. Most Americans got through that year all right, and they do not realize the fiscal gravity of our situation. Do not take my word for it. Our Nation's top accountant said that the year 2004 was "arguably the worst year in our fiscal history."

That says a lot. That is a big statement. That includes the Great Depression, that includes all the world wars, the Civil War. How on earth could 2004 have been "arguably the worse year in our fiscal history?" Because in that one year, Congress promised \$13 trillion worth of future spending that is completely unpaid for. Never in American history has Congress been that irresponsible, and that is why our Nation's top accountant made that declaration about 2004.

We will look at some future years. The debt that we are running up that our colleagues have explained so well is going to cost us so much in interest, that by about the last year of the Bush administration, we will be spending more money on interest payments to our Nation's creditors than we will be on regular domestic government in America. In a sense, it will be a better deal to be a creditor of this country than to be a citizen of this country, because the creditors will be getting more money than we will be, if we look at regular, nondefense, discretionary spending.

Let us look at another key date in our future. This was in the Wall Street Journal. At the rate that foreigners are lending us money, buying our debt, by February 9, 2012, the Chinese will have bought the last bond from a U.S. citizen, and then they will own all of our foreign debt. Their pace of buying our debt, of loaning us money, of getting us dependent on their credit is so ravenous that just a few short years from now, they will own all the foreign debt, if current trends continue.

Look at another key date. By the year 2017, that will be the first honest picture of the deficit in American history, because today the true size of the deficit is being disguised by the Social Security surplus. Last year, people like to say the deficit was \$412 billion. Well, the true deficit was \$567 billion, because \$155 billion of Social Security surplus was used to disguise the true size of the deficit. We owe that money to Social Security recipients. That is

one of the most solemn obligations our country has ever made, and yet people never mention the true size of the deficit. Well, by 2017 there will not be a surplus anymore, and then the true deficit will be revealed.

Look at the year 2035. A reputable group, Standard & Poor's, they rate all of the debt in corporate America, all the debt in the world. They are predicting that the U.S. Treasury bond by that year will achieve junk bond status. If that is not a dire warning, I do not know what is, because the U.S. Treasury obligation is the soundest obligation on this Earth. We have always paid our debts as a Nation. That is the gold standard of bonds. But here is Standard & Poor's, the most reputable private sector debt-rating organization, saying that if current trends continue, our bonds will be junk bond status.

Look at the final date on here. I think it is 2040. That is when, again, our Nation's top accountant says that it will take all revenues collected by the Federal Government to do one thing; every penny collected from Federal income tax, Federal corporate tax, all the other taxes to do one thing. What? Service the debt, pay our creditors. Interest alone. There will not be one red cent left for any national defense, for any Social Security, for any Medicare, for anything. That is not my prediction; that is our Nation's top accountant.

That is the sort of fiscal hole that these numbers that my colleagues have revealed are leading us into. This is a problem. This is a true crisis. I have called this the "road to ruin." That is what it is. We have to change course.

Let me show my colleagues this. A lot of folks say, well, 9/11 did all this. What people do not realize is the Cato Institute revealed in a recent study that President George W. Bush and the Republican Congress are the biggest domestic spenders, nondefense spending, since Lyndon Baines Johnson. The title of the report is called "The Grand Old Spending Party: How the Republicans Became the Party of Big Government," and this graph shows it. One might think that some previous Democratic Presidents were big spenders, but look at this: Carter and Clinton, they are down toward the bottom. Lyndon Johnson did try to give us a guns-and-butter budget, but only President George W. Bush has approached him in terms of growth of domestic spending. These are the true numbers; this is what the American people need to focus on. We have a dire deficit situation, and we need action.

So I appreciate the gentleman, my good friend from South Carolina, holding this Special Order. It is very important that all the business people of America, all the citizens of America, wake up and take notice of this situation, because they are not seeing it on regular television, they are not hearing the truth, they need to focus on reality.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him also for taking out this Special Order so that a group of our colleagues can speak with our constituents and speak with the American people about the budget situation that we face. And I think the previous presentations have left little doubt that it is a budget in crisis, it is a budget in moral crisis in terms of the priorities that this Nation needs to be addressing. It is also a budget in fiscal crisis, taking us over the cliff.

One might find that easier to take if, as the reward for our efforts, so to speak, we were getting adequate funding for major priorities, or if we were getting a good stimulus for the economy, but it actually seems we are getting the worst of both worlds. We are going over the cliff fiscally and we are not getting these other benefits.

So the American people are asking, where is this economic stimulus? Where is this support for what our communities need to grow and prosper and widen opportunity? I am afraid the answer is a lot of this money is down the rat hole, so to speak, in terms of the budget deficit, the growing debt; a lot of red ink, but not very much to show for it.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) was saying earlier that there is a familiar refrain these days about there is just not enough money to do this and that, and I can vouch for that as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I think there is probably no refrain that we hear more often, and we hear it on bill after bill after bill, that we would like to have more adequate funding for cancer research and heart disease research and the work of the Institutes of Health; we would like to build more highways, because we know this creates jobs and because we know it is a boost to the economy; we would like to do right by Medicaid because we know that millions of people are probably going to have their medicaid benefits cut or leave the rolls altogether, and that adds to the number of uninsured, the number of people who are not getting good health care.

Sometimes our colleagues say, well, we would like to improve the military quality of life. We know that we are actually spending less than we did before the Iraq war on base housing and on some of the provisions for our military families that do determine their quality of life.

Sometimes it is said, we would like to do more for first responders here, too. We are doing less for our first responders than we did before 9/11. And by first responders, we mean the people on the front lines every day protecting our communities, policemen, firefighters, emergency medical personnel, but there just is not enough money.

□ 1900

Sometimes we hear not enough money for after-school programs or other educational programs designed to close the achievement gap and to help communities meet this challenge of No Child Left Behind.

After all, No Child Left Behind was not just supposed to be a program for labeling classes failing. No Child Left Behind was supposed to be a way of diagnosing problems that needed addressing and then having some resources to address those needs. But we hear there is just not enough resources.

This very day, marking up the transportation bill in the Appropriations Committee, we heard there is just not enough money for Amtrak, not enough money to maintain rail passenger service in this country. We heard there is just not enough for community development block grants for the infrastructure and the rehabilitation of housing, to make our neighborhoods viable, and on and on and on. We just do not have enough money, we hear.

And, Mr. Speaker, I say this as a Member who does not believe any program, domestic or foreign, should have a blank check. Of course, we need to economize, and of course we need to be responsible with public funds. But I also believe that we need to be honest about where the problem is coming from in the Republican budget. And the problem is not mainly coming from domestic discretionary spending. And the ranking member of the Budget Committee has made this very, very clear. And we need to underscore it here tonight.

Our friends over at the Center For Budget and Policy Priorities asked an interesting question a while back. They said, where did that \$9.5 trillion fiscal reversal come from, going from \$5.5 trillion in projected surpluses over the next 10 years at the beginning of the Bush administration? What is now, Mr. Ranking Member, the projected addition to the national debt?

Mr. SPRATT. We say we have gone from a projected surplus between 2002 and 2011 of \$5.6 trillion to a cumulative deficit, over the same time period, of \$3.8 trillion. That is your \$9.4 trillion.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. That is the \$9.4 trillion reversal. And the analysts asked, Where did that money go? The largest chunk of it went to President Bush's tax cuts, which mainly benefit the wealthiest people in this country. A significant chunk of it went to defense and security spending after 9/11.

And of course in many ways we have had agreement that that spending needs to increase, but it is not the bulk of the increase we are talking about. It is not the bulk of the fiscal reversal that we are talking about.

The poor economy produced some of that. So there are many reasons for this. The tax cuts are the main reason. But the one thing that does not figure prominently in the fiscal reversal is domestic discretionary spending. That

has not been all that much above projected levels.

So the strategy of the administration and the strategy of the Republican leadership here in the House to pretend that we are going broke in this country because of these domestic investments, who can believe that? Who can believe we are going too broke because we are doing too much cancer research or because we are building too many highways?

The chart here pretty well tells the story. The Republican tax agenda worsens the deficit by \$2 trillion. And the gentleman can confirm, we are talking about \$1.4 trillion over the next 10 years and a worsened deficit situation because of the Bush tax cuts. And then if we take account of the alternative minimum tax and fix that, then that is another \$600 billion.

So something like \$2 trillion that the Republican tax agenda is going to cost us in the next 10 years is what that chart says to me. And then we have the next chart.

Mr. SPRATT. Yes, sir

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Then the next chart shows that the story is worse than that, because the Bush budget omits a number of 10-year costs. The repairing of the AMT I have already mentioned, over \$600 billion. The cost of social security privatization, \$750 billion.

The realistic estimate of war costs, beyond what we are appropriating this year, almost \$400 billion. Paying interest on all of this accumulated debt, \$267 billion; that is another \$2 trillion. Where is it going to end?

This is a deeper and deeper hole that we are digging, and very little of it has to do with domestic discretionary spending. But the main victims are these domestic investments that we are seeing every day on the Appropriations Committee squeezed mercilessly, and squeezed in a way that really do shut off growth and opportunity for our people.

Just think what we could do with the interest alone on this growing debt. This chart shows how interest payments are dwarfing appropriations for other priorities. The red bar is interest. The blue is education spending. The brown is environmental spending. The dark bar is veterans spending. And then you look ahead to 2010, you see the disparity is even more.

That is money down the rat hole, money that anyone in our hearing tonight could think of better public and private uses for that money that we are paying mainly to foreign purchasers of our national debt.

But that is where the money is going. It would be more than enough, of course, to fix the Social Security problem totally. And it is, in the meantime, preempting so much that this country needs to be doing to ensure expanding opportunity for all.

So I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for the Special Order tonight, for the presentations,

which I think have underscored quite clearly the deficit situation that we are facing, the accumulating debt, and what we are paying for that, the kind of opportunities lost because of this fiscal excess.

Mr. SPRATT. I thank the gentleman for his insights into this very critical problem. And I yield again to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT.)

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Well, I would just ask the gentleman, we have outlined what some would think would be quite a crisis. If you look at this chart, something happened in 2001: we passed all of those tax cuts. I would just ask the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) if this administration or the majority in Congress has ever expressed any acknowledgment that there is a problem.

Mr. SPRATT. Well, the administration avows its aversion to debt. And yet it keeps tacking debt on top of debt. The deficit in the year 2003 of \$378 billion, a record. A deficit the next year of \$412 billion, another record. A deficit this year of \$350 billion. And they claim to be cutting it in half, but it does not appear that way if you accurately project it.

And then the Bush administration begins its second term with this policy initiative, the first that the President brought forth, namely, to privatize Social Security. In order to privatize Social Security, the Bush administration would allow workers today to take up to a third of their payroll taxes, take them out of the Social Security trust fund account where they accumulate to a surplus, and put them instead into private accounts.

That means a diversion of well over \$3 trillion over the next 10 years, or the first 10 years during which that program would be implemented. And here is a depiction in bar graphs of how much additional debt would be stacked on top of the enormous mountain of debt already accumulated if privatization took place as the President proposed it. As you can see by the year 2025, 2028, we would have racked up \$4.9 trillion in additional debt on top of even more debt incurred in the ordinary budget of the United States.

So the Bush administration claims that it does not like debt any more than anyone else, but its policies contradict that claim; and the Social Security proposal coming on top of an already out-of-control deficit-ridden budget just leaves one incredulous as to what they say about their fiscal policy.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. So in other words, they have not only failed to acknowledge a problem, they are actually, with their policies, making the problem worse?

Mr. SPRATT. This would clearly make the problem worse, probably 100 percent worse over this 20-year period of time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Now, if you did not acknowledge that there is a problem, how likely is it that you will

take the very difficult, make the very difficult decisions that we had to make in 1993?

Mr. SPRATT. What we have seen in the 1980s and 1990s in coming to grips with the budget deficit, a compelling problem that nevertheless eluded a solution for years, is that unless the administration, the President and the leadership of the Congress, is focused upon this problem and there is a driving priority, it simply will not be resolved.

And that is the problem we have today. When we finally put the budget to bed, the deficit to bed, got rid of the remaining deficit in 1997, it was because President Clinton had not only made that his number one priority for his second term, but he put his first team on the field.

Every time we met for negotiations, Frank Raines was there, Bob Ruben was there, Erskine Bowles was there, everyone in the room had the President's proxy and could speak for him; and the participants, the budget principals, knew that the administration was pushing hard.

Unless everybody pulls hard in that same direction, there are too many otherwise outside forces that stray you off course. So you have got to have leadership to get this done. And we do not have that leadership.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. What you are saying about leadership, I think, really is important, because it is pretty easy to get cynical about Congress and the budget process over the 1980s and the 1990s as so often action was pretty ineffectual. But there were three times, were there not, when Congress rose to the occasion: once in 1990, on a bipartisan basis when the first President Bush joined with the Democratic congressional leadership and concluded a significant budget agreement; in 1993, with Democratic heavy lifting alone, an agreement that was actually rather similar to 1990 and moved the ball further; and then the 1997 agreement led by President Clinton, but with some bipartisan support.

Looking back to that 1990 agreement, which I think most of us remember as a difficult time, but a very positive achievement, is there any prospect that this present administration or this present congressional leadership has any inclination to undertake this sort of tack?

Mr. SPRATT. Well, if the gentleman will recall, in the late 1980s, we came to this conclusion that we had to have Presidential leadership as well as congressional leadership solidly behind us. And so we sponsored resolutions several years in a row which called for a budget summit.

We finally passed such a resolution, convened a summit, they met at Andrews Air Force Base something like 60 different days, and once again they succeeded. They capped discretionary spending; they devised the PAYGO rule. They reduced entitlements, rates of growth, did all of the things you needed to do.

The results were obscured by the fact that we had a recession. But the Clinton administration built upon the successes and upon the processes of the Bush administration, the Bush budget that moved us from a \$290 billion deficit, to a \$236 billion surplus. That was built on that foundation.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. If you fast forward to the present, as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) was suggesting, the budget situation is actually worse; the objective budget situation is actually worse now than what we faced in 1990.

This President Bush, unlike the first President Bush, does not seem inclined to even agree there is a problem. And the congressional leadership is totally disinclined to take this up. So it strikes me as a very dangerous kind of complacency that really, I guess, bespeaks a deterioration of the budget process, but also of leadership to use the budget process to get our fiscal house in order.

Mr. SPRATT. Well, the chart that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) is holding tells an awful lot. Every year during the Clinton administration, due to those three budget agreements, which the gentleman just described, the bottom line of the budget got better and better to the point where we finally had the budget in surplus for the first time in 30 years.

Every year since the Bush administration came to office in 2001, the bottom line has gotten worse to the point where today we have record deficits, three in a row, record deficits: 378 last year, 412 in the year 2004, it looks like 350 this year. There have been changes made in the margins, but nothing as dramatic and emphatic as what we did in 1993 and 1997, and that is why you do not see any real results of any substance on the bottom line.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. In 1994, there was a change in leadership in Congress. What happened in 1995?

Mr. SPRATT. In 1995?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. When the Congress passed budgets that included massive tax cuts, what happened to those budgets?

Mr. SPRATT. Well, in 1995 and in 1996 we had better and better bottom lines because we had a PAYGO rule, and we had discretionary spending caps.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. But did President Clinton, when he looked at those irresponsible budgets, not have to veto those budgets, showing Presidential leadership?

□ 1915

Mr. SPRATT. He did indeed. And then we had a point where we could not come to a conclusion on the budget. As a consequence, the whole government was shut down and President Clinton, upon being reelected said, I do not want to go through that again. I would like to see the budget principals get together with the White House budget principals and try to negotiate a deal earlier in the fiscal year, as opposed to

near the end of the fiscal year with our backs against the wall.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. But the Presidential leadership would not allow an irresponsible budget to become law?

Mr. SPRATT. Absolutely not. And then took the situation by the scruff of the neck the next year and saw to it that we finally brought it to a successful resolution, a phenomenal resolution: a surplus of \$236 billion in the year 2000.

On that high point, since we are just about out of time, let me thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and the others who participated, about a subject that is of great concern to all of us. We all have this feeling that the day of reckoning awaits us, and we would like to see this done consensually, with good policy.

REPUBLICAN AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here with some of my colleagues this evening, and we have a great agenda. We are going to talk about the agenda that we have had for this session of the 109th Congress and some of the positive accomplishments that we have made. But before I start on that, I do want to make a couple of comments, Mr. Speaker, regarding my colleagues across the aisle and some of the things that they have had to say.

They are so very concerned about the budget and how the budget works and about spending. Mr. Speaker, I just have to say it is interesting for me to hear them. Some of them are talking about how we cannot have tax relief that grows the economy because we would be doing away with needed programs. And then we hear that we are not growing the economy enough. And the interesting thing is you cannot have it both ways. You cannot have it both ways. You know, you have to set a course and you have to move forward on that course, and that is what this leadership has done.

We know that it is the people's money that we are here to be good stewards of. And it was so interesting, one of my colleagues just said, tax cuts are going to cost us. Tax cuts are going to cost us. Well, you know what, every time we pass a bill that spends another dollar, it is costing everybody that is paying taxes. When we reduce taxes, we give money back to the people that earn that money, the taxpayers. We leave that money in home communities. We leave that money where it belongs, with families.

Right now in this great Nation of ours, taxes are the biggest part of any family budget. We will set about on a course, the leadership in this Congress

has set about on a course, the President and the administration have set about on a course to get some of that burden off the backs of the American taxpayer; and we are working to reduce the size of this government.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you, I am so pleased that tonight we can take a moment and reflect. This is day number 169 on the 2005 calendar. It is day number 67 in our legislative calendar of the 109th Congress. And the majority in this Congress has, we are approaching the halfway point for this year and we have made substantial progress.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot help but notice that a remarkable thing has been happening on the floor of this very House over the past few months. It is something most people probably are not very aware of and I can assure you, listening to my colleagues tonight, it is something that the minority leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) probably hopes will remain unnoticed by most of the American people, but my colleagues across the aisle, many have been abandoning their party leadership in droves and they are voting in favor of a Republican agenda and our legislation. And it is worth noting tonight.

People say, oh, Washington is such a partisan town, nothing ever gets done. The town is in gridlock. And the minority leader will come to the floor and she will rail against the legislation that is being brought forth, and she will call it virtually everything in the book but good. And after all the hot air hits the rafters and people put their card in and cast their vote, dozens of Democrats vote for the legislation that she has just taken 5 minutes criticizing.

Why is it, Mr. Speaker? I think it is probably because the leadership in this body is crafting legislation to solve problems. We are here to solve problems for the American people. We are here to work to reduce regulation. We are here to lessen the tax burden. We are here to cast votes that will preserve individual freedoms for this great Nation. And we are attracting so many Democrat votes because the legislation that is in this body is legislation that appeals to the folks back home, regardless of what the party is. They are folks who are interested in a better life and a better quality of life for their families.

Here are just a few examples of what we have seen many of the Democrats come over and support, Mr. Speaker. One, bankruptcy reform. We passed that bill with 302 votes, 73 of those were Democrat votes.

Class action reform. We passed that with 200 the votes, 50 of those were Democrats.

The REAL ID Act. We passed that with 261 votes, and that included 42 Democrats who joined us in saying let us secure these borders, let us stiffen up these immigration policies.

The Continuity of Government Act passed with 329 votes, 122 of those were Democrats.

The Energy Policy Act passed with 249 votes, 41 of those were Democrats.

The Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act, 207 votes, 54 of those were Democrats.

Mr. Speaker, it is phenomenal, but the good thing is it is an agenda that the American people are interested in. It is an agenda that they support.

Mr. Speaker, I want to yield some time this evening to our chief deputy whip, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR) who is going to talk to us about some of the ways that that this legislation impacts those in his State.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), and I commend her for conducting this Special Order tonight. It is a great opportunity for us to gather here and to really do a number of things. First, to set the record straight after responding to the comments made from the other side; but also, as the gentlewoman pointed out, to talk a little bit about our vision for America and what the majority has been doing in pursuing that vision through legislation that we have worked on here in the House of Representatives.

First of all, I would like to join the gentlewoman in supporting her statement that we are here as shepherds of the people's money. It is and should be our aim to give back as much of the money that is earned by the taxpayers, to the people that are earning that money, so they can use the money and put it to the work in the best way and the most efficient way possible.

In that spirit, Mr. Speaker, I would also point out that the other side, in making the comment that the President nor the leadership has noticed that there is a problem with the deficit, nothing could be further from the truth. All that needs to be done is if they would look back to the deficit, to the budget that we passed to deal with the deficit. The President has set the goal that we must halve the deficit within 5 years. And this House of Representatives along with the entire Congress managed to pass a budget which for the first time in at least 8 years begins to chip away at the so-called entitlement programs. And we will have a bill later this year which does that, to begin to arrest the exponential growth in those programs.

But also we passed a budget that actually achieves an approximate 1 percent across-the-board cut in non-defense, non-homeland security spending. Although those savings may seem meager, this is the first time that we have done that since the Reagan era. So, Mr. Speaker, I would differ strongly with the statements made by the other side to remind the people across this country that we are serious. We are serious stewards of their taxpayer dollars, and aim to be able to give back more of the hard-earned money that the families and businesses across this country earn on a daily basis.

Now, let us turn to maybe the accomplishments that the gentlewoman

talked about just now, and make an introductory remark about how we are leading this country, how we are responding to those issues that are on the top of people's minds across this country, and certainly are doing everything we can to make safer our young men and women in uniform as they have volunteered their time and made a sacrifice for us to go over and to conquer the enemy that poses a tremendous threat to our freedom.

First of all, almost 4 years ago, on September 11, 2001, there is no question that all convention in terms of security was turned on its head. It was on that day, Mr. Speaker, that we saw 19 terrorists kill 3,000 Americans in about 20 minutes with box cutters on a plane. And that was something that was really demonstrative of the fact that we were not thinking the unthinkable. I dare to say that not many of us would think that such an awful, awful terrorist attack could occur on our own soil, but it did. And as the gentlewoman mentioned, we rose to the occasion and we passed the REAL ID act to make sure that no longer could a terrorist have access to false identification issued by any State government to board an airplane and use that airplane as a missile to kill thousands of Americans. No longer will that happen.

And as the gentlewoman points out, we were able to garner an awful lot of support on the other side. But mind you, it was not support coming from the ranks of the minority leadership, but rather it was the leadership on the Republican side of the aisle that took the lead on that issue.

But in terms of security and what is going on here at home, we are also dealing with a very real problem, and that is the spread of gang violence. This is not only a State problem, it is a national problem. It is an international problem that reflects the growing influx and occurrence of terrorists making it across the border, joining gangs, and participating in some very violent acts.

A little over a month ago here on the House floor, we passed what was called the gang buster bill to provide Federal law enforcement with extra tools to go ahead and identify and apprehend individuals connected with these gangs, and also to strengthen penalties so that we can put an end to violent activity in our community.

Once again, leadership position that was taken on the majority side of the aisle and, frankly, has not been at all echoed or supported by the other side's leadership. None of this, Mr. Speaker, none of this would be possible if we do not ensure that our economy remains strong.

In going back to the point the gentlewoman made about ensuring that the more taxpayer dollars that we can return to the people that earn it, the better off and the more productive our economy can be, we have witnessed over the last several months an incredible surge in the rate of job creation in

this country. We are at about a 5.1 percent unemployment rate nationally, which is a lower rate, the lowest rate that we have experienced in this country since September of 2001.

I can say, Mr. Speaker, in my home State of Virginia, we have an approximately 3 percent unemployment rate, which again demonstrates the productivity gains that we have made, but also demonstrates that we have got an environment where individuals have taken to putting their capital at risk to create jobs and creates value.

Now, we all know we are in a 24-7 global economy. We make no mistake about that. I think it is an agreed-upon fact that today we in this country, it is not just that our constituents are competing across town, that it is not the competitor there that we are only worried about, but the competitor across the globe.

□ 1930

You talk to some of the economic developers that are active in today's global economy and they will tell you there is just as much of a chance that an individual or company looking to invest resources would do so in Lima, Peru, as they would in Lima, Ohio. That is the reality of today's global economy.

That is why we must compete. We must ensure that our tax laws are competitive. That is why we need to make sure that we enact some permanency in the Bush tax cuts because there is nothing more obvious than the impact of those tax cuts on the economy itself and the tremendous surge that we have experienced.

We need to make sure that the regulatory environment is competitive. We cannot have our regulators promulgating burdensome regulations that inhibit capital formation in this country, because literally we are competing with every nation in the world.

Mr. Speaker, we also must be mindful of what we have seen as the proliferation of junk lawsuits. Nothing can be more inhibitive of capital formation than for an individual or a company to realize that they may be subjected to frivolous lawsuits and exposure to liability that simply is not warranted.

All we have to do is recall the class action suits against some of the fast-food chains that posed a potential risk to them, exposing them to liability for making hot coffee. Frankly, for an individual to drive up to a drive-through window, purchase a cup of coffee and then not realize that it is so hot that if it spills on them it would cause a burn, to me, defies common sense and reason.

It is those types of frivolous lawsuits that were included in this class action reform bill that we have passed and the President actually signed into law. It is that type of legislation that has been guided through this House, through the support of our membership, and certainly at the direction of our Speaker and our leadership.

Mr. Speaker, we have a daunting task ahead of us in approaching the

very real problem of Social Security. This is one of the most successful programs that we have ever faced in this country; but yet it is a program, given the demographics that we face in this country, that frankly is unsustainable.

The law, as it stands today, will not allow us to continue on the current course, and we have got to do something to bend the curve to ensure long-term solvency of our Social Security system and, at the same time, ensure that it is not only today's seniors that are beneficiaries of that program but it is our children and our grandchildren.

That is what we and the majority side of the aisle have set out to do. That is where the proposals have stemmed from. It is from the majority side of the aisle, and to date, Mr. Speaker, save but one Member on the opposite side of the aisle, we have seen nothing, nothing, no contribution from the other side of the aisle, not even contributing to the discussion that there is a problem facing the Social Security system today.

It is on that note, Mr. Speaker, with an issue of such import that I implore the other side of the aisle to join our discussion, to contribute to trying to come up with solutions for the American people. I implore the other side and the leadership there to begin to join the discussion in arriving at solutions for the American people.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia and thank him for his thoughts on the issue and the things that we have been able to accomplish so far in the 109th Congress. As the gentleman had said, there have been so many things that we have been able to do.

I have got a list of 100 ways in 100 days that we have been able to pass legislation that at some point he just mentioned: class action reform, funding for the troops, workforce job training, a highway jobs bill, a budget that reins in spending, boosting our border security and tsunami relief, all things that are very important. As he said, when it comes to issues of taxation, we are reducing the rate of taxation and the impact that has on our families.

Talking about the need for deregulation. We like to say in my district, we need deregulation that fosters innovation and spurs job creation because that is what it is about, creating those jobs, keeping this economy moving, keeping it effective. Of course, litigation, and being certain that we look at class action reform, the need for class action reform, the need for medical liability reform.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I am going to yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) who has certainly been very active in this agenda that we have in the 109th Congress, the common sense Congress; and he has truly been a leader as we have looked at many of the taxation issues, as well as many of the health care issues in this great Nation.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ten-

nessee for yielding. I appreciate very much the opportunity to be involved with her in this discussion tonight.

I was listening a little earlier, and I was thinking, do you not just get tired of the naysayers? Do you not just get tired of the folks who have nothing but doom and gloom to offer? It really is remarkable. I do not know what I would do if I felt that way every single day; the other side of the aisle seems to be so depressed and demoralized about what is going on. They are obviously not paying attention. This is an exciting time to be an American. It is an exciting time for all Americans.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), our whip, mentioned that it is a serious time, and it is a very serious time; but it is an optimistic time as well.

The gentlewoman mentioned many of the issues that we have acted on these first 169 days. It is the summer solstice. It is the longest day of the year, and the light in this longest day we ought to use to shed light on what we have done over these first 169 days. The gentlewoman mentioned a couple of them that I wanted to touch on.

Class action reform is one of them, real lawsuit abuse reform that we have been able to enact, and we have been working on that in Congress for years, literally, trying to get that done, and it took Republican leadership and it took a Republican Congress to get it done. We will end some of the harassment that is going on in terms of local lawsuits and protect consumers.

The budget resolution was mentioned where we are actually cutting real spending. The unsustainable rate of Federal spending that we have we are ending. We are ending that unsustainable rate and moving in the right direction. That is optimistic. That is positive for our Nation.

REAL ID, the border security that she talked about, and we are getting good support from other side of the aisle for these things. Forty-two Democrats were on that who voted for that, and it is a first step in the right direction as it relates to border security.

The bankruptcy bill the gentlewoman mentioned as well. That is real reform that had 73 Democrats.

The energy bill we have not talked much about, 41 Democrats on that bill.

I want to talk briefly tonight about something that is near and dear to my heart and I know near and dear to the gentlewoman's and that is tax reform. The tax reform that we have acted upon this year in this Congress is the death tax, permanent repeal of the death tax.

This is part of that, those posters and the items that the gentlewoman talked about 100 days, 100 ways, what House Republicans have done to strengthen America. The death tax, the other side of the aisle earlier this evening said that tax cuts hurt Americans. I was dumbfounded when I heard that. Tax cuts hurt Americans. Do my colleagues know that the death tax itself costs

the American economy up to 250,000 jobs annually? By permanently repealing the death tax, we would add more than 100,000 jobs each year. Nearly 60 percent of business owners say that they would add jobs over the coming year if death taxes were permanently and completely eliminated.

What does the death tax do? Well, it is the leading cause of the dissolution of thousands of family-run small businesses. Small businesses owned by families, the death tax comes at the end when somebody dies who is the senior in the family, and what happens is that that death tax is instituted, and they have to sell that family business in order to pay that death tax. It penalizes work. It penalizes savings. It deals an incredible death blow to small businesses.

Get this statistic: more than 70 percent of family businesses do not survive the second generation. Eighty-seven percent do not make it to the third generation. Why is that? How much does that death tax take? You talk about 15 percent taxes here is high, and 20 percent there, and the income tax has a rate that is higher than that; but what does the death tax take? Forty-seven percent. Forty-seven percent. It is no wonder that 70 percent of small businesses do not survive to the next generation.

So the death tax is unfair. It is unjust. It hampers economic growth. It increases the cost of capital. It artificially elevates interest rates, and this is another astounding fact: it probably costs the government and taxpayers more to collect the tax than the tax revenue that is gotten. That is the kind of nonsense that Americans are tired of.

So what did our Congress do, led by Republicans and joined by some commonsense Democrats? What did our Republican leadership and our Republican House do? We passed a bill to repeal permanently the death tax. I could not be more proud to serve with men and women who act on this issue and other issues in such a responsible way.

I am here to tell my colleagues that it is a positive thing that this Congress is doing, that this Republican leadership is doing, and that this Republican majority is doing; and we ought to be excited about where we are as Americans about the leadership that we have.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I am certain that in the gentleman's district in Georgia, just like in my mine in Tennessee, he has many family farmers. In our district in Tennessee, small business is the number one employer; and when I meet in my district with many of our farmers, with many of our small business owners, this is one of those issues, a permanent repeal of the death tax, this is something that they want to be certain gets signed into law. They are so supportive of the President and what he is doing there, and they want to be certain we get rid of that.

We look at it as a triple tax. You pay tax when you acquire an asset; you pay

a tax when you earn your income; you pay a tax when you maintain that asset; and then you die and you go and you pay it again. I talk a lot about sweat equity. Being a small businessperson, when somebody goes in there and they have that bright idea and they start that business and they put years and years and years into building that business and building that customer base, they want to be able to with pride give that to their children and their grandchildren, for that to be their livelihood, to continue that legacy.

I look forward to our being able to put an end to such an egregious tax, and I thank the gentleman for his leadership on that issue; and I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman ever so much. I appreciate that. I always thought it was two bites at the apple, but she is right. It is three bites that the government takes. That is unjust and unfair.

I just wanted to come and add a little perspective of what I believe is the optimism that this Congress is leading with, this Republican leadership and this Republican majority is leading with. I appreciate the gentlewoman doing this this evening and giving us an opportunity to show the American people and talk with the American people about the positive things that this Congress is doing, and I thank her very much.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) for his comments, and he is so right. There is a spirit of optimism in America; and we see that in our districts, folks that are growing new businesses, folks that are working, getting new skills, training for new jobs; and we appreciate that about them. We love seeing that in our districts, and we like seeing that optimism, and certainly here on Capitol Hill we are encouraged when we hear from our constituents that they are excited about some of the legislation that we are passing here, whether it is with bankruptcy reform or the REAL ID Act, taking steps to secure those borders, reducing taxes, supporting our troops.

A gentleman who knows quite a bit about supporting those troops is the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) with his military background. He is new to us this year here in Congress, and we welcome him, and we welcome his energy and his willingness to work on the great agenda that we have established in this 109th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for yielding.

I believe that we have much to be pleased about; and contrary to the obstinate obstructionism of the far left, much is being done. There is a lot of talk about how Republicans and Democrats cannot seem to agree on anything, and I do not think that portrays

an accurate picture of the work that is being done in the 109th Congress.

So far we have seen several significant pieces of legislation passed with overwhelming bipartisan support. We have watched as a significant number of Democrats have broken ranks to support business and family-friendly legislation.

□ 1945

So what have we been spending our time on? For starters, we have given a helping hand to small businesses by passing class action reform, a permanent repeal to the death tax, and a comprehensive energy policy, all of which contribute to the overall good health of our economy.

More importantly, these measures will help create jobs. Americans want to work. Americans want to earn a paycheck and want to feel like they have contributed to our part of the world.

We in Congress can help Americans do that by continuing to support and pass legislation that creates jobs. Consider this: the energy policy will create 40,000 new construction jobs by building about 27 large clean-coal plants. That will benefit the Commonwealth of Kentucky and the Ohio Valley, workers, suppliers, and also manufacturers and energy producers.

It will create 12,000 full-time permanent jobs related to plant operations, and the legislation allows for increased natural gas exploration and development that will create jobs and provide more than \$500 million in increased revenue for our economy. The comprehensive energy policy passed with the support of 41 Democrats who believe more in creating jobs and establishing an energy policy than playing petty politics.

Let us also consider the permanent repeal of the death tax which passed with the support of 42 Members of the Democratic Party. They voted to allow small businesses and family farmers to keep jobs and our dollars in communities, rather than sending them to bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

There is the highway bill that will create more than 47,000 new jobs for every \$1 billion invested in our country's transportation system. Not only does this create jobs, but it increases road safety so that our families and everyone else who travels them can be assured of a safer ride. And 198 Democrats supported this legislation. The minority leader did not, despite the fact that that bill alone will lay a tremendous foundation for future growth and future economic development throughout this land.

Mr. Speaker, 71 Members of the Democratic Party joined with us to pass the Gang Deterrence and Protection Act of 2005, again without the strength or support of their leadership. Gangs are increasingly becoming a problem in nearly every community in the Nation, and we are starting to hear disturbing whispers about gangs that

regularly bring illegal immigrants into this country to boost their gang membership and may be teaming up with terror cells to smuggle in terrorists. This is a serious threat to our national security that we must address.

But what can we expect from our Democratic leadership that continues to insult and denigrate our troops and the mission of our military, those who serve on the front lines? So we continue to be joined by rank-and-file Democrats, like the 54 Members who helped us pass the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act, the 42 Members who helped us pass the Border Security Act, and the 122 Democrats who helped us pass the Continuity in Congress Act.

Moreover, 143 Democrats joined with us to support our troops at the tip of the spear, fighting the war on terror to protect our Nation and keep our communities and our homeland safe. They made sure that they ensured our troops have the resources and tools they need to fight and win this war on terror.

Contrary to what the liberal media implies, there is strong bipartisan work in Congress; and there is a lot being accomplished. It is just too bad that the Democratic leadership continues being obstinate and obstructive when there is so much at stake for our future, our continuing economic well-being, the security of our homeland, and the security and jobs of ordinary Americans who depend upon us to pass commonsense, reasonable legislation.

As a joint team, we are doing our part and we are getting some great help teaming with rank-and-file Democrats. It is too bad the liberal minority leader does not want to join her own colleagues who did the right thing in passing helpful and progressive legislation.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for taking the time to share his thoughts tonight.

The gentleman is so right: it is family friendly, it is business friendly. That is the agenda that this leadership has. It is an agenda that is based on hope. It is an agenda that is based on the love of opportunity and knowing that we all want something better for our children, for our grandchildren. We all want to see America be vital and vibrant with a great economy and opportunity for all of our children.

As the gentleman was speaking, I thought about a great Tennessean, Alex Hailey, and a comment he used to make regularly. He was a wonderful author, and we are so proud of the works he created. He had a phrase that he would use often. It was "find the good and praise it." In this 109th Congress, the agenda that we have brought forward has a whole lot of good in it. It is wonderful to take a few moments on this first day of summer, on this 169th calendar day of the year, the 67th day of this 109th Congress, and praise the good work that is being done on this floor.

We have talked a lot about our economic security and homeland security.

Let us focus on moral security and the obligation we have for health care in this great Nation. One of the leaders in this debate here in this Congress is the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY), and he is going to talk about health care and some of the items we have been able to accomplish on our health care agenda.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join with the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) to talk about an agenda that helps get Americans back to work, that wins the war on terrorism and makes our Nation secure, and an agenda that focuses on affordable and accessible health care for all.

Like the gentlewoman, I go home every weekend and I do town hall meetings. I am going to do my 100th town hall meeting this weekend since I have been a Member of Congress. One of the things that keeps coming up is the cost of health care and what can we do to further that agenda.

There are a lot of things that we can do and have voted on in the past and will vote on in the future. It starts with the fact that doctors with high liability costs are being driven out of the practice of medicine because of those soaring liability costs. We need to confront that. We have done that on our side of the aisle and will continue to do that. Some reasonable limits on pain and suffering awards, which some States have enacted and have seen medical liability costs come down and stabilize.

In my State of New Hampshire, we have seen higher-risk specialty doctors, obstetricians, gynecologists, trauma doctors, surgeons, actually have to relinquish or curtail their practice because of soaring liability costs. What does that mean? It means people that need medical care may not be able to get it from the doctor of their choice, or they have to travel further, or it is simply not available in certain regions of my State. This is a national issue, and we need to get this on our agenda. This is something that we voted on on our side of the aisle and supported, and I hope that the other side of the aisle will join in this commonsense reform to make sure that doctors stay in business.

There are other things that we can do. Small businesses have so many employees, and they constitute about 70 percent of the new jobs; but for many small businesses they are also where, unfortunately, a number of Americans cannot afford health insurance through their business, the business owners, that represents a significant number of the uninsured people in our country. So allowing small businesses the same opportunities that large corporations have, to pool together and to do so across State lines, to join through bona fide business organizations, whether it is chambers of commerce, or like-minded business groups around the country, to be able to purchase health insurance through what are known as associated

health plans, is a commonsense reform that, once again, we are leading the way on.

I hope that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and there are some that support this because it is a great idea, it will give small businesses the same buying power that large corporations have so they will get better discounts in health care. It will allow them to spread out the risk of expensive treatments and to spread out high administrative costs, all things that small businesses endure. I hope that we are able to pass this here in the House and the Senate to enact this reform.

A couple of things that we have done in the 108th Congress, and we need to look at that because one of the big things that we have done is going to take effect on January 1, 2006, and that is a Medicare drug benefit for senior citizens. It is long overdue for senior citizens, especially those who are lower income, who are facing the cost of high prescription medicines, to have access through Medicare to prescription drugs so they can live healthier, more independent, longer lives. This was a reform that was adopted in the 108th Congress and will be implemented on January 1, 2006.

As part of that legislation, we also allow families and businesses, if they choose to match contributions of families, to create health savings accounts, and to do so up to an amount of \$5,000 for a family of tax-free dollars that they can actually use to purchase their own health insurance.

So this is a reform that we both know is something that will allow people to be wiser consumers of health care because it is their money that is going for either the purchase of health care or the purchase of higher deductible health insurance.

These are reforms, the Medicare drug benefit and health savings accounts, that we have accomplished in the last session of Congress. It is my hope that we will be able to push this agenda forward, this positive agenda, so we have lower liability costs for doctors and we allow small businesses to pool together to purchase health care in collective units.

Now one last thing that has enjoyed bipartisan support and the President deserves a great deal of credit for, those are community health centers. I have one in my district that recently got Federal funds that is going to expand its operation, nearly double its square footage. Community health centers are alternatives to more expensive hospitalization. And they give people of lower income or people who need preventive care, primary care, better access to health care facilities. We have dramatically increased the funding for community health centers over the last several years from about \$1.1 billion when President Bush became President to this budget, the Labor-HHS budget, to about \$1.83 billion. This will enable more of these community

health centers to be built, improve access to all Americans, but in particular lower-income Americans.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to the poster that is right behind the one that is displayed next to the gentleman. It is the commonsense Congress, and the gentleman has touched on this several times. I think it is worth drawing some special attention to: common sense.

The legislation that the leadership has brought forward in this Congress, the things that America supports us on that we are hearing from them, they are pleased with the agenda that we have moved forward on, is based on common sense. A couple of other things the gentleman has mentioned, whether it is the community health centers or the health savings accounts or the medical liability reforms, one of the points the gentleman just made is so true.

What we are talking about is the taxpayers' money. The gentleman said, "It is your money." That is so true. We realize this is the taxpayers' money. It is not our money. It is not government's money. It is the taxpayers' money. I agree so wholeheartedly with the gentleman from New Hampshire. We trust the individual to make those decisions on how to spend that money. We trust those local governments and those wonderful community health centers. The gentleman has them in his district. I have them in mine. What wonderful work they do, and how cost effective they are.

It is exciting to see that we have a budget where we have had a reduction in discretionary spending. We have a budget where we are putting the emphasis on priorities. We are beginning to turn this around. Forty years of Democrat control grew program upon program upon program without accountability. Now we are beginning over the past decade to see that accountability move in place; and with the positive proactive agenda that we have this year, we are seeing action.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, that brings something we have to reiterate. When the tax cuts the gentleman referred to were passed, we had an unemployment rate of over 6 percent. Today, that unemployment rate is 5.1 percent, and 3.5 million jobs have been created.

□ 2000

When we talk about making our economy more competitive so that Americans can compete around the world, tax reform is a significant issue, and a stimulus package that drives jobs is a huge issue to make sure that Americans have every opportunity, anybody that wants to find a job has the opportunity to find a job. As I have noted already, making health care more accessible and more affordable through some of the reforms that I outlined will make our economy more competitive and enable businesses to better afford health care for employees and our Nation to grow.

I thank the gentlewoman so much for organizing this hour.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman for joining us. He is so correct in jobs and talking about jobs. We are pleased that the unemployment rate is at 5.1 percent. One of the points that we have accomplished this year, with bipartisan support, is the jobs training bill, giving the training that is necessary, and allowing that to be accessed by individuals right there in their home communities so they have the skills necessary to move forward and to secure good jobs right there in their communities for their families.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) for his comments and thoughts on the agenda in his first Congress here with this 109th Congress.

Mr. MCHENRY. I certainly appreciate the leadership of the gentlewoman from Tennessee here in Congress, and I know her constituents are well represented by her values here. We are talking about the GOP agenda here in the House, our conservative agenda, our agenda that has solutions, real solutions for the American people. We passed a conservative budget that reins in non-defense, non-homeland security discretionary spending by 1 percent. It is a start. It is a move in the right direction. It is the most conservative budget since Ronald Reagan was in office. However, at the same time it funds key priorities, like our national defense, our homeland security. It funds fire departments. It funds police officers. It does the right thing for the American people. We passed a good budget.

We also passed class action lawsuit reform with bipartisan support. It reins in trial lawyers. It reins in these out-of-control lawsuits and lawsuit abuse.

We passed bankruptcy reform that says you should make good on your bills. We have bankruptcy reform. It was bipartisan as well.

REAL ID, Border Security Act. Border security, ladies and gentlemen. The Republicans in this Congress have taken on this challenge and some Democrats bought in.

Death tax repeal, eliminating the death tax.

A transportation bill that ensures that we have good roads in this Nation and funds priorities.

We also passed pro-life legislation, reasonable pro-life legislation that does the right thing for minors and does the right thing for the unborn child as well. We have passed good legislation.

The American people need to know that, Mr. Speaker. The American people need to know that we are a Congress that is focused on getting real results for people. We are not here about partisan rhetoric. We are not here to complain about the process. We all know the process here in Washington, D.C. is not what it should be. That is the way it has been for over 200 years in this Nation. But we are a free people

with high ideals that we try to live up to as a Nation. And we are a Congress that respects those values.

But I certainly appreciate the gentlewoman from Tennessee having this hour so that we can discuss the solutions that we have put forward, not just as Republicans but as Americans, working across the aisle on a bipartisan fashion.

Before me is a chart, Democrats Running to GOP Solutions. They are buying into our agenda. They are buying into our agenda. Bipartisan Victories for America Expose House Democrat Leadership's Lack of Vision. We have had five major pieces of legislation pass the House with strong bipartisan support that has an impact on people's lives.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman so much for his comments. I think this is one of the things that we hear repeatedly from our constituents. They want to see us solve problems. They have appreciated how aggressively we have attacked the agenda this year and have worked to move forward on a positive, proactive track.

Bankruptcy reform. That is something that they have tried to pass for years here in Washington. For years. As I was in the State Senate in Tennessee, we would hear about the gridlock in Washington in not being able to move this forward.

Class action reform. We have been hearing for a decade that that was needed.

The REAL ID Act. Since September 11, 2001, we heard about the need to secure our borders and to be certain that those driver's licenses were using proper documentation.

Permanent repeal of the death tax. I cannot remember a time that I was not hearing about the need to repeal this. A continuity of government, having a plan for that. There again, since September 11, 2001, we have been hearing of the need for this.

I would just express to the gentleman that I feel it has been a very aggressive 67 session days that we have had and 169 calendar days that we have seen so far, and we have our list that we have been talking through tonight of 100 ways, in 100 days, that we have been able to pass legislation.

One thing I think that is important to point out, also, is that not always does it mean when we say we are passing legislation that we are adding another law to the books. Many times what we are doing is repealing and taking laws off the books, repealing. We are deregulating instead of increasing regulation. We are lowering taxes instead of increasing taxes. We are trusting people to make the decisions they need to make for their families. I think that is one of the differences.

Mr. MCHENRY. If the gentlewoman will yield, the gentleman outlined a few major pieces of legislation. We had 73 Democrats vote with our Republicans for bankruptcy reform. The leader on the left voted no.

Class action lawsuit reform, we passed with 50 Democrat votes. Their leader, out of step with her own Members, voted no.

REAL ID Act, 42 Democrats voted yes. Their leader voted no.

Permanent repeal of the death tax. What happened? Forty-two Democrats voted yes. Their leader voted no.

Continuity of government, bipartisan support for this, included 122 Democrats voting for it. They thought it was the right thing to do. Their leader voted no.

The agenda on the left is all about no. No action, no results, no ideas. And we on the right, we the Republican majority, are acting. We are moving forward. We are trying to do what is right for all Americans, not just say no.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. We have a newspaper here in Washington, D.C. It is called *The Hill*. Today there was an article, *Progressives to Unveil Their Core Principles*. The article talks about how some of the liberal Members in the House felt sidelined, and I am quoting, "felt sidelined as more centrist Democrats have chosen to side with Republican leadership on several issues."

I would suggest to the gentleman that the reason so many Members of this body do talk with us, side with us, work with us, vote with us to pass this legislation, is because it is what America wants to see happen. It is what their expectation is and the legislation they want to see.

Mr. MCHENRY. That is a wonderful way you put that. We are trying to take a consensus agenda on what the American people need and want and the direction this country wants to continue heading. And that is more local control, individual ownership and responsibility, keeping more of what they earn to help their families, help their communities, help raise their children and improve small businesses around this country.

I certainly appreciate the gentlewoman from Tennessee taking the time to be here tonight to discuss our agenda, not a Republican agenda but an agenda for America, to do the right thing for all American people. That is what we are trying to do. My constituents back home in western North Carolina certainly have those same ideals in mind. I am sure yours do as well there in Tennessee. I thank the gentlewoman for hosting this hour.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentleman so much for being here this evening. I think one of the things that we have seen is that so many Members of this House have supported tax relief for every taxpayer. They know that this majority has supported tax relief for every single taxpayer, not for just a few. And, true, we have targeted that relief to those at the lower end of the earning scale and that is an important thing to do.

In the past few years, we have also reduced income tax rates across the board. We have eliminated that death tax. We hope that the Senate works

with us, making this a permanent elimination.

We are allowing businesses, we talked about small businesses and jobs creation, allowing businesses to deduct more for their equipment, for their depreciation, for their leasing, so that they can up those capital expenditures. We are seeing capital investment increase and jobs growth take place.

For States like my State, Tennessee, and others that do not have a State income tax, we have passed a bill restoring the Federal sales tax deduction. In my State in Tennessee, that is putting hundreds of millions of dollars back into our State economy. It is a great thing. It is a great thing for Main Street. We know that it is the right thing to do, to be sure those dollars stay at home. The last thing we need to do is to take more out of somebody's paycheck, more out of their pocketbook, and turn around and send it here to Washington, D.C. to try to decide how we are going to send it back. Leave it at home.

The tax relief for individuals and for small businesses has paid off. We started with a recession in 2001 and now we are entering the 25th month of steady jobs growth. Twenty-five months. Since May 2003, this economy, not the government, not Washington, D.C., but this wonderful free enterprise system in this great Nation has created nearly 5 million new jobs. The reason we see this jobs growth is not because government is creating jobs, it is because this leadership in this Congress, in this administration, understands create the right environment and get out of the way. Let the free enterprise system do what they do best, which is create jobs. Over the past couple of years, 25 months, an average of 146,000 jobs a month. We have got historically low unemployment and we have got steady growth.

We have led on tax relief. We have led on the effort to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse in government and on the effort to cut Federal spending. We passed a budget, despite outcry from the left, that allowed a .8 percent, nearly a full percent cut in budget authority in non-defense, non-homeland security spending.

An issue I know my constituents care deeply about is the growing problem of illegal immigration. We have taken a strong stance on this issue and have made a terrific start with passage of the REAL ID Act. We are funding more border agents. Our list goes on and on, 100 ways, in 100 days.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here to visit with my colleagues tonight. We look forward to continuing the conversation and to continuing to work on a positive, progressive, proactive agenda for America.

ANNOUNCING FORMATION OF OUT OF IRAQ CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK). Under the Speaker's an-

nounced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I am here this evening to talk about something new and wonderful that has happened in the Congress of the United States of America. I am here to talk about a new caucus that is named Out of Iraq Caucus. I am here to talk about the men and women of this House who have decided they can be silent no longer. I am here to talk about men and women who represent various points of view relative to support for the President from the time that he first announced he was going into Iraq to now. I am here to talk about why we have formed this caucus, what we plan to do, but more than that this evening, we are going to focus on our soldiers and those who are in Iraq serving this country, those who are there in harm's way, those who have been killed in Iraq, those who are up at Walter Reed Hospital suffering from serious injuries, having lost limbs, having lost their eyesight, those who do not know what the future holds for them.

□ 2015

We are going to focus on that this evening because it is extremely important for the families of these soldiers to know and understand that we support these soldiers. We know that many of them went there because they were called to duty. They were recruited to go to Iraq because their President asked them to do so, and they wanted to serve this country despite the fact they did not understand all of the reasons why. Many of them went to serve because they thought that Saddam Hussein was responsible for 9/11. But, of course, we know now that Saddam Hussein was not responsible for 9/11, and many of the soldiers know that now.

So this caucus has been formed. We have 61 members, and they are still adding on. We met this morning at 10 a.m., and we will continue to meet as we develop our mission statement, as we help to define who we are.

Basically, we have come together to say we want out of Iraq. We want out, and this caucus is not putting a time certain. This caucus has not concocted demands about how we want to get out. We simply want our young people out of Iraq. So we will provide support to other Members of Congress, other caucuses who want to get out of Iraq. We will provide support to the citizens of this Nation, the organized national groups who want to get out of Iraq.

We will organize not only coming to the floor as we are this evening to talk about various aspects of this war. We will also organize workshops and seminars. We will travel, some of us, to different regions in this country, responding to citizens who are asking for Members of Congress to come and explain this public policy to them. We will be available to meet with the families of servicemembers who have been killed,

who have been injured. We have families who are asking to meet with somebody, anybody. We have people who are asking to meet with Donald Rumsfeld, who cannot get any response, who are not being talked to. We are going to meet with them. We are going to talk with them. We are going to share with them what we know.

But more than that, we are going to be an ear to family members who need to talk with someone about why their son or daughter died in Iraq. We are going to spend the time and give them some attention because we think that the least that we can do is sit and talk and listen to family members.

Some of them will say that they are very proud that their child or their son or their relative served in this war, and we will commend them for the pride that they feel and the fact that their relative, their child, their brother, their father served. Some will say that "I once support the war but I no longer support it." We will listen to them, and we will hear what they have to say. And we will explain to them how we feel at this time about getting out of Iraq.

And so this is a caucus that will have the ability to extend itself not only to the organized groups and organizations but again to the family members.

I would like to point out something about this war. We have heard many of the statistics and much of the data over and over again. But we have to remind folks we have been there now since March 19, 2003. We have 1,722 soldiers who have died in this war, and the numbers mount each day. The number of soldiers injured: 13,074. We have many Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle who are going up to Walter Reed Hospital to see the soldiers there who are injured, and the stories that we hear coming back from those visits break one's heart. These are stories of young men and women who had hopes and dreams. Many of them went to war because they had no jobs. They did not know what the future held for them, and they thought, Perhaps if I go and serve my country and get an income, perhaps I can do good. I can not only serve my country, but perhaps I can get ahead. Perhaps I can learn a trade. Perhaps I can learn something. Perhaps I can exploit some of my talents and show what I can do. But when I come home, I want to go back to school. I want to go to college. I want to get married. I want to have children. I want to contribute to my community.

Well, unfortunately, these 1,722 will never be able to realize their hopes and their dreams. They have died. But the question still remains for many of us, Why are we in Iraq? What is the real story? We know now there are no weapons of mass destruction. Why are these young people dying?

I want to relate an interview that I watched on television this past Sunday. This past Sunday, as many folks in America do, I watched some of the

great television shows, and I was watching George Stephanopoulos as he interviewed the Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice. And he interviewed her. They talked about, of course, the work that she is doing in the Middle East, working with the issue of Israel, the Palestinians.

But then he segued to the war in Iraq. And he said to Condoleezza Rice, "As you know, there has been a lot of talk back here in the United States about these Downing Street memos, the minutes of a meeting with Prime Minister Tony Blair in the spring of 2002 where they discuss their meetings with the United States." And then he said, "I want to show you what one mother, Cindy Sheehan, the mother of a U.S. soldier, had to say about that memo this week." And then they showed Cindy Sheehan, mother. She said this: "The so-called Downing Street memo dated the 23rd of July, 2002, only confirms what I already suspected. The leadership of this country rushed us into an illegal invasion of another sovereign country on prefabricated and cherry-picked intelligence."

And then George Stephanopoulos said to the Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, "How do you respond to this, to what Mrs. Sheehan said? How do you respond to that?" Condoleezza Rice started out with her explanation. She started out by saying, "Well, I can only say what the President has said many, many times. The United States of America and its coalition decided that it was finally time to deal with the threat of Saddam Hussein." And she went on with the typical kind of discussion and explanation in line with the message that is given by this administration. Along the way, she said, "When you consider what the Iraqi people had gone through in the Saddam Hussein regime's reign, what about the responsibility to the Iraqi people?"

I was struck by this conversation because not one time did the Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, acknowledge Cindy Sheehan, who had been on the screen with the question that was raised by George Stephanopoulos. Not once on Father's Day did she say, we are sorry your son died, we feel your pain, we understand how you must feel. Not once did she recognize her. Not once did she recognize the death of her son. Not once did she show any sympathy. But oftentimes we hear from this administration how much they care about the soldiers.

Well, the Out of Iraq Caucus is going to show not only do we want them out of Iraq but we care about them. We will never fail to acknowledge a mother who is in deep pain about the loss of her son. Not ever will we be on national TV and not take a moment to say we too care about our soldiers. No. This conversation basically focused on our responsibility to the Iraqi people.

My first responsibility is to Americans and to those American soldiers.

My first responsibility is to their safety. My first responsibility is to their well-being. My first responsibility is to acknowledge them and their families and their parents. And my responsibility, as a public policymaker, is to tell the truth. We all know now there were no weapons of mass destruction. We cannot tell these young people why they are really there. We cannot tell them that there is an exit strategy. We cannot tell them why many of their friends that they met in this war died in vehicles that had no armor. We cannot tell them why they died up in Fallujah. We cannot tell them why they died in Operation Lightning. We cannot tell them what they are doing in Operation Spear.

We hear all of these fancy, concocted names for the operations, but what we do not hear is the definition of why they are doing what they are doing. Are they simply being organized into these special operations to try to send a signal to the American people that they are really in charge? What are they to do when they go into these battles and into these special operations? Are they to shoot whatever moves?

We know that, yes, thousands of Iraqis have died because we have young people in these special operations, Operation Lightning, Operation Spear, operation this, operation that, who were told to shoot anything that moves. Many of them cannot live with the psychological damage that is fostered upon them because they are shooting and they are killing and they do not have all of the answers.

So today we focus on our soldiers, and we say to Cindy Sheehan we are sorry about the loss of her son and we thank her for caring enough to ask the questions, to be involved. We are trying to get public policymakers to do the right thing. So tonight, as we further announce the Out of Iraq Caucus and the Members who have signed up to do the work of providing the platform of creating the voice for those who want to speak out, we focus tonight on our soldiers in Iraq. Our prayers go out to them. We want them to be returned home. We want them to realize their dreams and their hopes and their aspirations.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), who has been on this floor night after night talking about these issues, the gentlewoman from California that basically said we want out of Iraq; administration, tell us how you are going to do it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for starting tonight's dialogue.

It is true. I have been on the House floor, I think, 79 times, maybe 80 in the last year for 5 minutes after the end of our workday, of our congressional day. And my message has been we need to figure out how to bring our troops home. Never in that message have I said it is the troops' fault that we are there and that they are to be criticized. We are not going to pick on the warriors. We are not going to blame them

because their leadership, their administration, sent them there to do a job that was not necessary.

The death of over 1,700 of our troops does not say to me that to honor those deaths we need to send more troops, we need to have more death.

□ 2030

I do not think that honors those who have died. I think that, in fact, it is a shame that we would even think of sending another young person, male, female, another older person, our National Guard, our Reservists, into an area that we did not need to be in in the first place. There is no excuse for the United States to have started a war in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, our Constitution states that Members of Congress must be chosen by the people of the United States and that Congress must represent the people of the United States. That means that we as Members, Members of Congress, need to act and listen to the people when they speak. Well, I have been speaking for 80 days, every time we are in session, for 5 minutes, but now the American people are speaking. They have spoken.

The latest Gallup poll released last week indicates that the American people are ready for our military in Iraq to start coming home. They are saying, bring our troops home. They say this, and some actually supported the war at the beginning, but now, like the three of us up here, they want to honor our troops, they want to honor the families of our troops, they want to bring them home safe and whole.

When I say whole, I know what I am talking about. Two years ago, I had major, major back surgery at the Bethesda Naval Hospital. And when I was able to walk, I walked the halls and visited the troops that had come home then. It was August 2 years ago, so they were just beginning to come home from Iraq. I want to tell my colleagues, we are not talking about people that are hardly wounded at all, we are talking about young people who have virtually been destroyed physically. Their minds are there, though. They know what happened. But we are doing such a disservice to them if we send more young people, more troops in an area where they too are going to get injured or killed.

Nearly 60 percent of Americans believe that the United States should bring home some or all of our troops from Iraq, and the Gallup poll tells us that only 36 percent of Americans support maintaining our current troop level in Iraq. Only 36 percent. This is the lowest level of support for the war since it began in March 2003, and nobody is saying we do not support our troops. They know these statistics are all about bringing them home because we do support them, and we know that when they come home they will be safe. It is absolute in these numbers that Americans are not criticizing the troops, the warriors; they are criti-

cizing the war, how we got into it, how badly it has been managed, and why there is absolutely no plan on how to bring our troops home.

The American people have stated loud and clear, and their numbers are increasing also; the more they see what is happening to their neighbor, a friend of their son or their daughter, they are realizing that, oh, my, it can happen to any single one of these young people that we send overseas for a war that was not necessary in the first place. The only way to end this death and destruction that occurs every single day is to start the process of bringing our troops home. Clearly, the American people are way ahead of Congress on this issue.

Unfortunately, the President of the United States is way behind on the issue of Iraq. We have asked the President to come up with a plan for ending the war. He has not. He has no plan for victory, except to leave our troops in harm's way as targets for a furious insurgency who look at our sons and daughters as occupiers. What, then, should Members of Congress do?

Well, I have been working hard on this, as the gentlewoman from California told us. For one thing, I came up with a plan in January when I introduced legislation that is H. Con. Res. 35, calling for the President to begin bringing our troops home. Thirty-five Members of Congress support this legislation. And then we continued this effort on May 25 by introducing an amendment to the defense authorization bill calling on the President to do this simple thing: Create a plan for Iraq and bring his plan to the appropriate House committee. Mr. Speaker, 128 Members of Congress, including five Republicans and one Independent, voted in favor of this sensible amendment.

It is clear that the United States must develop a plan to bring our troops home. That is the only fair thing to do for the people of this country but, most importantly, for the troops. They deserve to know when they get to come home, and their families deserve it equally.

I have loved being up here with my colleagues. I am proud to be a member of the Out of Iraq Task Force in the House of Representatives. It is not that we want to run away from anything; we certainly believe that when the United States pulls our troops home, that we do have a responsibility and we must be working with the Iraqis to help them with their failing economic and physical infrastructure. We know that we can help them with that, but we know we cannot do it while we are in the midst of destroying their cities at the same time we are trying to put them back together. First, we bring our troops home, then we work with the Iraqi government and we help them put their country back together.

We are also proud of the Iraqi citizens who went to the polls and voted, but we are also very clear that what

they were voting for was the fact that they wanted their country back in control by the Iraqis, not by the United States military. As soon as we do this, we can start working with them, and we can work with the international world, get them all involved, so we can be doing the right thing for Iraq and the Iraqi people who are also being destroyed by this war.

So I thank the gentlewoman for letting me be a part of this. My colleagues will hear more from us. We have a lot of ideas, but our major idea is two words, "troops home," in honor of those young men and young women and the Reservists and the National Guard who are doing something that they were told they must do; and they are serving their country the best that they can, but they are getting very poor guidance from the leaders of this country.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), not only for being here this evening, but for all of the work, all of the hours, all of the time that she has put into this effort.

I now yield time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who too has been a leader in opposing this war. She warned us early on that we should not just give permission to the President of the United States to go to war without understanding what the reasons were and without having that debate. So, unfortunately, our debate is taking place a little bit late, but it is taking place.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman from northern California, the Oakland area, (Ms. LEE), for all of her work and for being here this evening.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for her leadership and for really seeing the wisdom and knowing that this is a defining moment to bring us all together in our Out of Iraq Caucus.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) has recognized the fact that there were those who voted for the war and those who voted against the war, but we know what is going on with our young men and women now, and so the gentlewoman decided to bring us all together to try to help us figure out how to get out of this mess. I think the country owes the gentlewoman a debt of gratitude.

Also, to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), I just want to say to her, sometimes she is the lone voice in the wilderness. Sooner or later, though, if you call it the way it is and stick with your principles and stick with what you believe is right, people will hear you; the country will hear and the world will hear, and I think that is what we are seeing now. So I just want to thank her for her leadership as well.

Mr. Speaker, so often we get caught up in the rhetoric of our positions and what we believe, and oftentimes forget about the human face and the toll of

such a war, such an illegal and immoral war.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) so eloquently talked about the callousness and the insensitivity of this administration toward those who have died and who are risking their lives, when Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice did not acknowledge the sacrifices and the pain that a courageous mother, Cindy Sheehan, must be feeling.

As the daughter of a veteran of two wars, I feel this, and I understand this, and I think that our administration, whether they have children in Iraq or not, I think that they should stand up for these young men and women and feel their pain and try to help figure out how to first say, I am sorry; and secondly, say, let us begin to figure out how we develop a plan and begin to bring our young men and women out of harm's way.

Mr. Speaker, that is how we really support our troops. Empty rhetoric does not work when young men and women are dying.

So let me just say, I visited the troops, I guess it was probably a couple of years ago at Walter Reed Hospital. This is the untold story of this war. There are thousands of our kids who will be disabled for life, thousands of our young men and women who lost their limbs, who cannot see, their faces have been blown off. It has been a financial difficulty; they have come back to the lack of financial and economic security. Some of them are losing their houses, they have lost their jobs, their credit cards. And we serve on the Committee on Financial Services and we know how the credit card companies are messing with them in terms of their debt and the bankruptcy issues.

They come back and, upon their return, they see that they have very little in terms of veterans benefits. They have long lines they have to wait in. The mental health services are almost nonexistent. We know what post-traumatic stress syndrome is. Our young men and women need mental health services like they have never needed it before. Yet, we cannot get legislation nor funding to provide this kind of care for our kids, and I think that is a shame and a disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, I went to a funeral of a young man who was killed in my district in the war, and it was unbelievable. This young man was a proud soldier, and I was so proud of him, because he was determined that he was going to go and serve our country and wave the flag and make sure that democracy prevailed in Iraq, and he honorably died, and it was very sad. But his family told me that while they may not have agreed with what he wanted to do in terms of going into the military, that they supported him going; they loved him and they missed him, but they wanted to get more involved in trying to help us figure out a way to ensure that no more kids are killed

like this. I hear this over and over and over again. I think all of us here hear that over and over again.

But yes, we went and we bombed the heck out of Iraq, so we have I think a duty and a responsibility to help rebuild and reconstruct the country. But as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) said, we need to first begin to develop a plan to get our young men and women and bring them home, get them out of harm's way, because they are the targets of the insurgency. I do not believe there is going to be any stability as long as the Iraqi people believe and see that their country is occupied by U.S. forces. So we are putting them and keeping them in harm's way.

So we need to bring them home, and we need to figure out a plan to do that as soon as possible.

Also, let me just say that in the Committee on International Relations, a committee upon which I serve, we had authorized or reauthorized the State Department Reauthorization Act a couple of weeks ago. So I tried to offer an amendment for withdrawal, and I think there were 12 or 13 votes for that. But then I decided that since the President and since Secretary Rice continued to say that we do not want to permanently occupy Iraq, we do not want permanent bases, I said, well, let me do an amendment to the State Department authorization bill and all it would say is we just do not intend to have permanent bases in Iraq. Well, I think, on a bipartisan vote, it got about 15 votes there.

Mr. Speaker, I share that because we hear the administration saying, no permanent presence, no permanent bases; yet we see just the opposite in terms of funding and appropriations and beginning to create this scenario to build permanent bases. So we have to ask the question: What is really going on?

□ 2045

We know that the administration misled the American people and the world that there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. We knew that then. Now, I think the Downing Street memo and the other facts are coming out so that the public will understand what we said then, we knew that there was no connection between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda and 9/11 and Iraq.

We knew that then, but now, thank God for the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the hearings that we are holding. We are beginning to educate the American people so that they know what we knew. And I think people are listening, people are beginning to say was this worth it? Was this worth it? Was this worth over 1,700 of our young people being killed, countless number of Iraqi civilians being killed, \$300 billion-plus, and I think Defense Appropriations just had another \$45 billion in it, that was not with my vote, but to that, some voted for the other day, and so where does this end? Where does this end?

And so I just wanted to say tonight in closing that we need to insist that the administration announce that they will develop a plan for bringing our young men and women home, announce a plan for stabilizing and to help bringing in the international community to stabilize Iraq, and this means the international community in a real way.

And we need to make sure that the administration says to the American people that there will be no permanent bases in Iraq. Because, if we do that, we are going to be up to trillions of dollars in terms of this war. And I hate to see that happen, because here we have people who are homeless, we have young kids who need a decent education, and we need affordable housing, we need a universal health care system.

And we need to take care of some domestic needs. With the war going on like this and with billions and billions of dollars being spent, especially if we intend to have permanent bases, we will never meet our domestic needs and the responsibility that we owe to our American citizens.

So I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for her leadership and for making sure that all of us come to this floor and call it like it is and tell the truth, and begin to beat that drum and begin to wake up America so that we can save our kids from being bombed and from the suicide attacks and from the violence that they are dealing with in such an honorable way.

These kids are courageous, they deserve our support, and they deserve our support in a real way. And that means our support by insisting that they come home so they can be with their families and get the type of care that they need.

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE). We appreciate so very much the work that she has been doing and her wisdom and early warnings about this war.

Next, I would like to call on the Congressman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), who is a veteran who knows a lot about war because he served.

He is a gentleman who has been unsettled about this war for months. And he has taken many opportunities to ask what we are doing. When are we going to have a discussion? When are we going to speak out? When are we going to have hearings? What is going on with this?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank him for raising those questions. I wanted to thank him for being a part of what we are attempting to do with the Out of Iraq Caucus. And I welcome him this evening to this discussion.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I just want people to know that the whole country is not run by distinguished women from California. But I certainly do appreciate the leadership that you have taken. God knows how much better off our country would have been if

we had recognized the brain power that we have with minority women in this country. But we have that to work on.

I do not know where to start, because there are certain people that believe that we are not supporting the troops when we are anxious that they return home well to their families.

But I can say that I visited those that have been wounded. I have the 369th. They call themselves the Hell Fighters. They are a National Guard outfit. They have been to the Persian Gulf. They have been to Iraq. I am always there when they leave. I am always there when they come home. And I want the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) to know that they appreciate what we are doing for them.

What people do not understand when they talk about the patriotism of our fighting men and women, they are so right, unlike those of us who have a responsibility to participate, whether we are going to have peace or war for our great Nation, any veteran will tell you, when that flag goes up, you are in the military, you salute it. You do not challenge the military. You do not challenge the President. You do what you have been trained to do, and that is to destroy the enemy.

And so no matter how patriotic our men and women are, and they are that, bringing them home to their loved ones means we are patriotic too.

I remember when I first enlisted in the Army. I was 18 years old. I had not finished high school. Spinning my wheels. Did not know which way to go. Saw the uniform, saw the check, could send the check home to mom; my brother had before me. Seemed like a pretty good deal.

Now, no way did I know that in August of 1950 I would be sent to Korea, which I am embarrassed to admit I had no idea where it was, to engage in a police action, which did not sound too bad to me, being a policeman. I went there in August of 1950 and guess what? The Second Infantry Division that left Fort Washington to go there is still there today.

Getting into wars in countries is a heck of a lot easier than getting out of them. And so in that war, we did not even declare war. You know, it was a police action. It was the United Nations. It was Truman telling us to go. The majority of our outfit, they were either killed or captured.

And since I had an opportunity to be exposed about education, I felt for those who God blessed to allow to live, that we had a special obligation not to allow that to happen to other people's kids. Here we have a situation where people who have served their country and joined the Reserve have been called up two and three times. Families have been broken. I remember when I introduced my draft bill the first time, I got a call from Senator HOLLINGS from South Carolina.

He says, you are worried about minorities and poor folks. You better start thinking of my Reservists. Fam-

ilies are being broken. People have already served and being called two and three times. Wives are complaining, the employers have not called them since their favorite employee was twice called up to serve the country. Tuition has not been paid. Marriages have been broken.

And then you take a look at the other side, the Charlie Rangels all over the country, different colors, different backgrounds, different languages, some not even citizens, but spinning their wheels and hoping for a better way of life, getting an education like I got with the GI bill. Where do they come from?

Well, just ask the Pentagon. They do not come from communities that chief executive officers live in. They do not come from kids with families of those in the White House or in the Pentagon. As a matter of fact, I have talked with some of the private marketers that are hired by the Pentagon, and as someone says, they rob banks because that is where the money is. They fish because that is where the fish are. They recruit where the hopeless are in terms of unemployment.

I asked the question, Do most of them come from areas of high unemployment? Yes, that is where they recruit. It makes sense. Now we have not got the retention. People are not being retained. People are not volunteering. You would think that if the President of the United States believes that, and that fighting terrorism in Iraq is in our national defense, what a speech a President could give to all of America. I could hear it now.

If we do not bring freedom and liberty to every country that seeks it, if we do not have regime change where we do not like people, if we do not bomb and invade and superimpose our government, then our country would be jeopardized. So what are you asking, Mr. President? We are asking all of you not to allow the poor to just carry on this fight. This is a fight for freedom and liberty; you should be so proud to enlist.

So you make a plea to the poor, to the middle class and to the wealthy, to the men and women of this country that love it. Volunteer. Instead, what do they say when they do not meet their quotas? Well, the \$10,000 for 3 years did not work, so we doubled it to \$20,000. Now it is \$30,000. So do not worry, Mr. President, it is going to be \$40,000, and we will get those kids one way or the other.

And now we have got parents saying, do not do that to my kid. He loves us. If I were offered \$40,000 at 18 years old off the street of Harlem, I would ask how many years can I take? I mean, that is a lot of money even with inflation being what it is today.

It seems to me that we should not need a draft if Americans thought we were doing the right thing. Makes sense to me. You would leave your job in the Congress if you are young enough. If there is something I can do,

I will do it because this country has been extremely good to me.

But I know one thing, that for all of the people that are talking about that they are supporting the war, I ask one question: Would you put your kids in harm's way to indicate your support for this war? It seems like it is so easy, when I was a kid for someone to pick a fight, and then when it is time to go to fight, they said I will hold your coat. That is what America is doing today.

Do not tell me that these young people want to fight, I suppose those people being drafted do, that would be an insult to all of the heroes and sheroes that have been drafted, or at least the men that have been drafted that defended this country. But the truth of the matter is that if we have a draft, if we had a draft, we would not be in Iraq today.

If we had a draft, we would not be rattling swords in North Korea. If we had a draft, we would not be threatening Syria and Iran. We would go to the international community with the strength of the United States of America and persuade those countries that terrorism is not just an American problem, it is an international problem, and with mutual respect, sit down and talk with them to see how we can bring peace to the Middle East.

This is going to be one of a series of nights that we know how awkward it is to be against the President when the Nation is at war. But that is true of so many things that happen that we are not proud of. It is so easy not to stand up. It is so easy to say, I hope they know what they are doing in Washington. It is so easy to hope that everything is going to work out okay.

But we have had a lot of problems in this country because people are waiting for someone else to do something. And I think as our numbers grow that we will soon make it comfortable for people just to ask the question: Why did we go in the first place? Was there a plan which projected for the 21st century to go to knock off Saddam Hussein before 9/11? Did everyone that was in the Cabinet that has written books, Clark did, Woodward who wrote the book on this, did O'Neill, who was Secretary of the Treasury when they said that after 9/11, the President was committed to go after Saddam Hussein, even though there was no evidence that they should go that way?

You hear more about the papers from England, the intelligence reports that we have got to show that even the British intelligence indicated that was the route that we were going. We find now all of the reasons that were given were not true. And as you hear us over and over, and listen to the priests and the nuns and the ministers and the imams and the rabbis recognize that all we are talking about is not defending our country, we have got a new standard now.

□ 2100

You do not go to war just when you are attacked. You do not go to war just

when you have imminent danger of being attacked. Now, subjectively, we can go to war to avoid the attack being imminent. That subjective standard will no longer be just ours. It will belong to North Korea, South Korea. It will belong to India and Pakistan, and the moral value of the greatest democracy that has ever been created would be shattered just because no one stood up.

Well, we have seen what happened in history and we want to make it very comfortable for you not to get involved politically but to listen to the facts. And at the end of the day, when Condoleezza Rice and the President are asked, and maybe some Democrats, if you knew then what you know now, would you have committed this great country to war? Because all you got out of it is a pretty crummy election even by Florida standards, and the fact that we have no clue as to where we are going to get additional troops to stay there until they get their act together or to train them.

So I thank the three gentlewomen from California and especially, well, not especially, because all of the gentlewomen are giants in this. And one day, and I hope one day soon, the people who held us in suspicion because we are standing up, and we have to thank God that we have constituents that allow us to do it, that the least that we can say that we have done is to create an atmosphere where good people can stand up when they know in their hearts that they are doing the right thing.

Ms. WATERS. I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and ask him to remain for a colloquy if he has a few moments with all of us here. I thank the Members for focusing our discussion tonight on our soldiers and helping to remind people that these are real human beings, as I said before, with hopes and aspirations. And when they die, not only are those hopes and aspirations gone, but the family members are left devastated and destroyed by these deaths, and we have got to do more to slow our support for them.

It is not their fault if they are there. They answered the call for many reasons, some of which the gentleman described so wonderfully well in his presentation. Some people looking for just a job, for income. Some folks looking to serve their country, to answer the call for whatever reason. And what we have got to be sure about is that we do not allow these sacrifices to be taken lightly.

For example, we hear some Members saying, who wish to support the war, to continue to support the war, saying all they show on television are the bombings, the suicide bombings. All they show are the deaths and the destruction. They do not show the good stuff.

Well, I get very upset when I hear that, because what they are literally saying to me is that somehow the loss of lives of our soldiers should take sec-

ond place or third place to some news about perhaps cleaning up a street somewhere. I cannot say news about new electricity or clean water or schools or any of that, but they simply say over and over again, all they show are these suicide bombings; they do not show the good stuff.

Well, I do not like hearing that because, again, they are relegating the loss of lives to some secondary status. And tonight we draw attention to the importance of the soldiers, how we are proud of them and their families. And I mentioned earlier that in this interview on Sunday with Mr. Stephanopoulos and Condoleezza Rice, even though he drew her attention to Cindy Sheehan, the mother who had a comment who had been here in the Congress trying to raise the discussion, he drew her attention to her and something she had said and Condoleezza Rice never acknowledged her, never said she was sorry about the death of her son, never gave any attention to the fact that this woman in pain was attempting to create this discussion.

So tonight there is a mother who has not been answered, who has been trying to get some response from Donald Rumsfeld. Now, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) has put together a letter to Rumsfeld saying, please talk to her. Not only has she been knocking down the door, making the telephone calls, she is talking about other mothers and other families. Please talk to her. Please respond to her.

I signed on to that letter today. We are going to encourage all the members of the Out of Iraq Congressional Caucus to sign on to that letter. But I would like to ask all Members here tonight, do you think that we should not only join as the Out of Iraq Caucus in asking Donald Rumsfeld to respond to Ms. Sheehan and perhaps other mothers and families, should we not have an organized way by which they really are talked to, that they have an opportunity to even come to Washington?

If we can offer \$40,000 to their children to come to Iraq, can we not help them to come to Washington and be recognized and talk with them, not just in ceremony, not just one day perhaps out of the year; but when they say they need some answers that they want to know, should not we encourage Donald Rumsfeld and Condoleezza Rice and this administration to be more sensitive, more sensitive?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Well, I do not want to be a cynic but is not Donald Rumsfeld the same individual who was stamping his names on letters to families when he was sending his condolences to them when their family member had died in Iraq? He needs a lot of training on how to be compassionate.

I think it is a very good idea that we send that letter, but I do not think we should be surprised that that is the reaction that Cindy Sheehan has gotten from Condoleezza Rice and from Donald Rumsfeld.

There seems to be something missing in the picture, and that is compassion and really understanding what this means to those who are fighting the war and the families of those who have lost their loved ones and who are getting loved ones back who are totally, totally wounded, both physically and mentally. So yes, we should do that.

Mr. RANGEL. Let me try that. Suppose they did call and the mother would say, Would you remind me as to why my beloved child lost his or her life? Would they say because Saddam Hussein was a mean, evil man when we have so many mean and evil people in this world? Would they say that we wanted to show them what democracy really is and they had an election? Would they say that we want to bring order to this part of the world? Would they say that, and we are prepared to do this further, the President's inaugural address and speeches he has given?

How would they answer about the weapons of mass destruction if the bereaved asked?

Suppose they asked, Was this connected with the attack of 9/11? What would they say? Suppose they said, well, Whatever happened to Osama bin Laden? Was he not the villain, or did 15 of the 19 terrorists come from Saudi Arabia? Suppose they asked, What were you doing tip-toeing through the gardens at the ranch with the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia?

Suppose they asked, Why did the Saudis get special treatment in leaving the country to go to Saudi Arabia? I do not know. Maybe, just maybe, we should not ask a mother to get those kind of answers. And just maybe, we should not have to lose a child to challenge those type of answers.

Ms. WATERS. Those are certainly tough questions and, of course, just as Condoleezza Rice gave the framed message that she always gives when she is speaking publicly, Saddam Hussein was a terrible man, Saddam Hussein was a threat to the United States. Now, the Middle East will be better off without Saddam Hussein. Those are the kind of answers I suspect that she would give. But I think when Condoleezza Rice is on national television in an interview where millions of people are watching, and you have a mother who is shown on television raising a question and you do not even take the time to acknowledge that mother, to say, Ms. Sheehan, I am sorry about the loss of your son.

Ms. LEE. I have noticed this administration is so detached, totally detached from the impact and the ramifications of what they have done in terms of their policy, their warmaking policies. Remember, Secretary Rice was one of the chief architects of this war. Perhaps it is very difficult for her to realize that being one of the chief architects of this war, that Cindy Sheehan lost someone that her policies were responsible for.

So I think not only should we encourage Secretary Rumsfeld to meet

with them, we should insist on that. The Defense Department, the Pentagon, and the White House, they owe these families an audience. They owe them an audience.

And the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) asked the questions that would be very difficult, I think, for this administration to respond to if, in fact, Cindy Sheehan asked those questions. But I believe they have paid the supreme price and they deserve the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State and all of those who crafted this war, they deserve to meet with them to hear from them, and these parents need that audience and that is the minimal thing that we should insist on.

Mr. RANGEL. I tell you as a lawyer and someone that would advise somebody, I would not ask them to ask to see Secretary Rumsfeld.

Members have to remember this is the same person that told the whole country that he did not know whether we were winning or losing the war. Is that something to tell someone?

He said that it is a slog, whatever the heck that is. And he said something that he was so right in, that he really did not know whether we were creating more terrorists than we were killing. And we can answer him, and the world can, because we lack the sensitive sophistication to understand that a life is a life, whether it is an American, whether it is an Iraqi, in the tens of thousands and sometimes the hundreds of thousands.

I talked with Colin Powell about this and I asked him, How do you train a young patriotic soldier to go to a foreign country to kill terrorists that you do not know what they look like, what uniform they wear, what language they speak, and you can only react when you are being fired upon? Can you imagine how many terrorists we create when these cowardly people go to a school, go to a hospital, go to a mosque and fire at our troops? And those who have served would know, you have no option except to destroy where that fire is coming from. And if you destroy innocent people, we no longer call that human life. You know what we call it? Collateral damage.

Ms. WATERS. Well, Cindy Sheehan has already made the inquiry. She had made calls. She has written the letter and now she has asked the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) to help her. He started to circulate a letter, which I signed, and I would like to encourage others, because we are not encouraging her to start this. She has already been doing it. And she is simply put out with the fact that she can get no response, no returned telephone calls, anything. And I think that we should give her some support.

In addition to that, I do think perhaps one of the things we should look at further is support for all the families who have questions, because what I am hearing is families are not being told how their children died. They get the message that it has happened, but

when they start to ask for details and particulars they are not getting it. And as they put together these budgets, these budgets ask for whatever they think it is they need. And I think it is time to include in the budgets some assistance to the families, that they can at least be respected enough to be given the information, for somebody to sit down and talk with them and answer the questions, tell the truth. They may not get the truth. They may not get the questions answered in the way they want to, but I think we are going to have to try to work at forcing that to happen.

□ 2115

I am awfully sorry that our time has expired. I see two more Members just entered the room. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) just entered the room and I know that they wanted to be part of this.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise tonight with my distinguished colleagues in the newly formed Get Out of Iraq Caucus. We stand together in this hallowed place to advocate for the majority of Americans who believe that President Bush must get our men and women home from Iraq. It was the great politician and diplomat Adlai Stevenson who said: "Patriotism is not a short and frenzied outburst of emotion but the tranquil and steady dedication of a lifetime." I want to thank each and every American who believes strongly in this cause for making that dedication and speaking out about what you believe to be wrong for our great Nation.

I want start off by reading a very telling quote: "War should be the politics of last resort. And when we go to war, we should have a purpose that our people understand and support." This quote was made by none other than former Secretary of State Colin Powell, a senior member of the Bush Cabinet leading up to the war in Iraq. The truth is that this war was not a last resort, and it most certainly does not have the full support of the American people. The truth is that this Administration has continuously changed the truth about their motives for going to war. First they said it was about weapons of mass destruction, then when we found out the truth that there weren't any in Iraq, they said the war was now about Saddam, and today they tell us it's about establishing democracy in Iraq. The real truth is that this Administration has no real plan, they had no plan before going to war, they have no plan to get out of this war and most dangerous they have no plan to win this war. The truth is that our men and women of the Armed Forces are the ones caught in the middle, the ones who have to fight and risk their lives in a war that has not end in sight.

Earlier this week I offered an amendment to the Defense Appropriations bill which would have increased funding for training the Iraqi National Army by \$500 million. This Amendment would have doubled the amount of money appropriated for training the Iraqi National Army within the Iraq Freedom Fund. However, Mr. Inslee's amendment to lift the \$500 million cap on funds for training the Iraqi National Army was accepted into this Appropriation. Therefore, I will work with Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member MURTHA to in-

sure that additional funds are appropriated for training the Iraqi National Army. The Jackson-Lee and Inslee amendments reinforce the point that the best way to get U.S. troops out of Iraq is to train the Iraqi troops to take care of their own nation. Clearly, more money is needed to not only train these inexperienced troops to defeat the insurgency, but also to pay troops to enlist in this new army despite the obvious danger they face. At this time of increased danger for our troops, this Amendment reiterates the fact that we need to be transferring more responsibility upon the Iraqis to take care of their nation and develop a plan to remove our U.S. troops.

To this date at least 1,783 members of the U.S. military have died, 152 from the State of Texas alone, since the beginning of the Iraq war in March 2003. Since May 1, 2003, when President Bush declared that major combat operations in Iraq had ended, at least 1,585 U.S. military members have died. There have been at least 1,909 coalition deaths in Iraq, which means that more than 93 percent of the coalition deaths have come from the U.S. Armed Forces. This President told us that there would be an international coalition going in to fight the Iraq War, the truth is that it is our troops and our troops alone who are on those front lines suffering mass casualties and the burden of this war.

Just last month I wrote to President Bush respectfully requesting him to rescind and repeal the Defense Department rule that bars public viewing of the flag-draped coffins of fallen soldiers upon their arrival back to the United States in the spirit of patriotism, honor, and respect for the service that they have given. This overly restrictive rule contravenes the First, Ninth, and Tenth Amendments to the United States Constitution as well as the principles of due process and equal protection as it relates to the decedents, their families, and each American who wishes to honor one who has fought for his or her Nation. In addition, this rule violates the Freedom of Information Act by arbitrarily narrowing the scope of material that may be accessed under the law. While the stated objective of this policy is to protect the privacy of the decedents' families, its effect reaches unjustifiably broad and in a manner repugnant to the foundations of the democracy in which we live. The American public has been allowed to view and honor fallen soldiers of wars dating as recently as the Persian Gulf War in 1990-1991 under prior Administrations of both political parties. The current policy is clearly deceitful to the American people, who deserve to know the full truth about the War in Iraq.

When our American troops are the ones fighting abroad, it is our military families who must also suffer. They wait every day and night hoping to hear from the loved ones, praying that they are not put in harm's way, that they may come home soon. Too many families have not been so lucky, finding out the news of a loved one's death is not only emotionally traumatizing it can have long term effects for the family that may never be repaired. Such is the case with the family of Army Spc. Robert Oliver Unruh a 25-year-old soldier who was killed by enemy fire near Baghdad on September 25th of last year. Unruh was a combat engineer, who had been in Iraq less than a month when he was shot during an attack on his unit. Several days after learning of his death, his mother had gone to

the hospital complaining of chest pains, Hamilton said. She was feeling better the next day but saw her son's body Saturday morning and collapsed that night in her kitchen. The poor woman literally died of a broken heart, her beloved son killed in action, the emotion of it all was just too much for her to take. There is also the story of the Danner family in Branson, Missouri who had to spend this last Father's Day sending their father off to War in Iraq. Col. Steve Danner will be heading to Fort Riley, Kan., on Monday to begin training before he begins a two-year tour in Iraq with the Army National Guard 35th Support Command. At 52, Danner isn't hesitating to fulfill his duty, but said it's going to be tough to leave his family. "I'm as ready as I'm going to be," Danner said. "My main regret is my youngest daughter is going to be a senior at Branson and I'll miss her softball games and probably her graduation next year. We have to recognize it's a reality. I've done this a lot of years. It's my turn again." Danner's wife, Katie, said she was "shocked" when she learned her husband would be headed to Iraq. "I knew there was always a possibility, but you would have thought, at his age, that the war wouldn't be at a point where they would need his talents," she said. The Danners have four children, Aryn Danner Richmond, 29, of Phoenix, Andrew, 20, Alex, 19, and Audrey, 17. Katie Danner said they understand why their father needs to leave, but "I don't think they really know what it will be like for Dad to be gone." It's a true shame that loyal soldiers like Col. Steve Danner have to be called up at the age of 52 because of this war and the current recruiting shortage. It's stories like that that make my heart ache and that strengthen my resolve to defend the rights and welfare of our American soldiers and their families.

We must all stand as champions for our men and women fighting abroad. These soldiers who bravely reported for duty, they are our sons and our daughters, they are our fathers and mothers, they are our husbands and wives, they are our fellow Americans and they deserve better than the predicament that this Administration has placed them in. Many of these soldiers are now themselves standing up and demanding answers about this war. One such brave individual is Sgt. Camilo Mejia, whose case I know that many tremendous anti-war organizations have championed. Camilo spent six months in combat in Iraq, and then returned for a 2-week furlough to the U.S. There he reflected on what he had seen, including the abuse of prisoners and the killing of civilians. He concluded that the war was illegal and immoral, and decided that he would not return. In March 2004 he turned himself in to the U.S. military and filed an application for conscientious objector status, for this he was sentenced to one year in prison for refusing to return to fight in Iraq. He has eloquently stated: "Behind these bars I sit a free man because I listened to a higher power, the voice of my conscience." He was finally released from prison on February 15th of this year. I applaud this young man for making a conscious decision not to fight in a war he does not believe in, it's a disgrace that this young man who truly is a conscientious objector was treated like a criminal.

Time and time again this Administration has said that there are no plans for a draft, that we have an all-volunteer Army, but all of us know the real truth that there is in effect a back door

draft taking place. Individuals who have been out of the Armed Forces for years and many who were told that they had fulfilled their commitment are now being taken away from their families and put in this war. Under the Pentagon's "stop-loss" program, the Army can extend enlistments during war or national emergencies, about 7,000 active-duty soldiers have had their contracts extended under the policy, and it could affect up to 40,000 reserve soldiers depending on how long the war in Iraq lasts. The Army has defended the policy, saying the fine print on every military contract mentions the possibility that time of service may change under existing laws and regulations. Its just cowardly to hide behind fine print when it comes to peoples lives being at stake in this war, every day their tours are unjustly extended is another day they risk their lives. However, many of these individuals are now fighting back against this injustice, rightfully asking why they, who have already proudly served their Nation, must now be recalled for a war that has already claimed too many American lives. Fewer than two-thirds of the former soldiers being reactivated for duty in Iraq and elsewhere have reported on time, prompting the Army to threaten some with punishment for desertion. The former soldiers, part of what is known as the Individual Ready Reserve (IRR), are being recalled to fill shortages in skills needed for the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The military families know the helplessness that many of their loved ones serving in Iraq feel because they are being given no voice in this war they are being told to fight. An article in the Christian Science Monitor article written in July 2003, almost two years ago when this war was still in its infancy, had a number of very telling quotes from U.S. soldiers in Iraq. One soldier said: "Most soldiers would empty their bank accounts just for a plane ticket home." Another soldier, an officer from the Army's 3rd Infantry Division said: "Make no mistake, the level of morale for most soldiers that I've seen has hit rock bottom." The open-ended deployments in Iraq and the constantly shifting time tables prompted one soldier to remark: "The way we have been treated and the continuous lies told to our families back home has devastated us all." In yet another Army unit, an officer described the mentality of troops: "They vent to anyone who will listen. They write letters, they cry, they yell. Many sometimes walk around looking visibly tired and depressed. . . . We feel like pawns in a game that we have no voice [in]." These quotes were taken almost two years ago, I can only imagine how these soldiers and others like them feel seeing that this war is still going on and with no real end in sight. These quotes individually are sad, but collectively they represent a pattern and unfortunately once again it is our men and women in the Armed Forces who are paying the price.

Even members of this Administration who orchestrated this war have their failures in this war. L. Paul Bremer, has said "horrid" looting was occurring when he arrived to head the U.S.-led Coalition Provisional Authority in Baghdad on May 6, 2003. "We paid a big price for not stopping it because it established an atmosphere of lawlessness," Bremer said. "We never had enough troops on the ground." Prior to those comments he had also stated last September that: "The single most important change . . . would have been having

more troops in Iraq at the beginning and throughout." He said he "raised this issue a number of times with our government" but admitted that he "should have been even more insistent." Even Defense Secretary Rumsfeld, the architect in many ways for this war admitted U.S. intelligence was wrong in its conclusions that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. "Why the intelligence proved wrong [on weapons of mass destruction], I'm not in a position to say," Rumsfeld said. "I simply don't know." When asked about any connection between Saddam and al Qaeda, Rumsfeld said, "To my knowledge, I have not seen any strong, hard evidence that links the two." With leadership such as this, how are our troops supposed to have any confidence in this Administration and their handling of this war??

This Administration is creating new veterans everyday by sending our soldiers to Iraq, meanwhile it has done nothing to help—the courageous veterans we already have here in our Nation. There are over 26,550,000 veterans in the United States. In the 18th Congressional district of Texas alone there are more than 38,000 veterans and they make up almost ten percent of this district's civilian population over the age of 18.

As soldiers return home from serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, perhaps the most disturbing trend is their inability to find jobs because of their veteran status. Take the story of Staff Sgt. Steven Cummings from Milan, Michigan. Cummings' wife took out two mortgages and the couple accumulated \$15,000 in debt during his 14 months overseas, because his salary was less than he was making as a civilian electrical controls engineer. Looking back, those almost seem like the good times. In the year since he's been home, Cummings has been laid off from two jobs. While other reasons were given for the layoffs, Cummings thinks both were related to his duty in the Michigan National Guard and the time off it requires. Like some other veterans who have returned from Afghanistan and Iraq, he is struggling to find work. "I don't know what I'm going to do now. I'm in the exact position I was when I came back from Iraq," said Cummings, a father of two. "I'm 50 years old and I have a mortgage payment due. I'm tired of it." Cummings, a member of the 156th Signal Battalion who did telecommunications work in the Iraqi cities of Baghdad and Mosul, said he is surprised to find himself in this predicament. Cummings said he thought he was returning to Gentile Packaging Machinery Co., where he worked for 11 years in Bridgewater, Mich., but he was told he was laid off the first day he was back to work, he said. Cummings said he considered suing the owner, but freshly home from war, it just seemed overwhelming to do so because he felt "devastated, betrayed, worthless." A few months later through a veterans program he was able to get work at Superior Controls Inc., in Plymouth, Mich. But, he said he was laid off from that job on May 20. He said he was told the company was downsizing, but he believes it was because he complained about a company policy that said it could not promise to hire returning veterans from war. Some are changed by war, and find the civilian jobs they had before are no longer as meaningful. This has also been the case with Cpl. Vicki Angell, 32, who was assigned to the 324th Military Police Battalion out of Chambersburg, Pa. She gave up her job as a customer service supervisor at

an equipment company to serve in Iraq, and it took her a year to find a job she was happy with as an editor at The Sheridan Press in Hanover, Pa. "You send out a lot of resumes. You try to do everything you can do, but it's really hard to account for the time you are in Iraq, and really to try to make that, the things you were doing in Iraq relevant to what an employer is looking for today," Angell said. Sgt. Benjamin Lewis, 36, who also lost a stepson to the War in Iraq, was a civilian chef who worked at a restaurant in Ann Arbor, Mich., that burned down while he was deployed in Iraq with the Michigan National Guard, said some employers directly told him they could not hire him because he could be deployed again and needed weekends and time off in the summer for drilling. Others, he said, asked if he struggled mentally because of his time at war. He got so desperate he considered returning to Iraq with a new unit. It is because of cases such as these and many others throughout our nation that I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 1352, the Veterans Employment and Respect Act offered by my colleagues Representatives ALLYSON SCHWARTZ and JOE SCHWARZ. This vital legislation already has 161 Congressional cosponsors and would give companies up to \$2,400 in tax credits for each veteran from the Afghanistan and Iraq wars that they hire. Unfortunately, we may be able to give companies incentive to hire recent war veterans but it seems we can not get this Administration to put the same effort in looking after our veterans in the first place.

As soldiers return home from serving in Iraq and Afghanistan the need for medical care, living assistance, and disability benefits are steadily increasing. This puts a strain on an already-overburdened Veterans Administration, which has not been adequately funded by the Bush Administration to meet these challenges. The fact is that more than 30,000 veterans are waiting six months or more for an appointment at VA hospitals, and there are more than 348,000 veterans on the waiting list for disability claim decisions. This President has long ignored pressing domestic concerns for a war that did not need to be fought and for which so many good American men and women have given their lives.

It was our second President John Adams who aptly said: "Great is the guilt of an unnecessary war." Unfortunately for our nation, our current President has not felt the weight of this guilt, for if he had our loved ones in the Armed Forces would be home now. This Administration told us that the international community would join us in Iraq; they said the world would be a better place because of this war and then they said major combat in Iraq was over. Today as we see our men and women every day giving their lives in Iraq, we know that this war has only caused a greater divide between our nation and the international community, this war has only increased hatred for our nation, it has not made us safer as promised, it has in fact put us in greater danger. President Abraham Lincoln speaking after the conclusion of the Civil War, gave a vision for our nation that I hope we can follow today, he said: "With malice toward none; with clarity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan-

to do all which may achieve and cherish a just, and lasting peace, among ourselves and with all nations." Before I conclude I would like to take time to read some of the names of the soldiers from Houston who have given their lives in Iraq and honor them with a moment of silence.

Spc. Adolfo C. Carballo, 20, Houston, Texas Died: April 10, 2004, Baghdad, Iraq.

Pfc. Analaura Esparza Gutierrez, 21, Houston, Texas Died: October 1, 2003, Tikrit, Iraq.

Spc. John P. Johnson, 24, Houston, Texas Died: October 22, 2003, Baghdad, Iraq

Spc. Scott Q. Larson, 22, Houston, Texas Died: April 5, 2004, Baghdad, Iraq.

Sgt. Keelan L. Moss, 23, Houston, Texas Died: November 2, 2003, Al Fallujah, Iraq.

Pfc. Armando Soriano, 20, Houston, Texas Died: February 1, 2004, Haditha, Iraq.

Cpl. Tomas Sotelo Jr., 20, Houston, Texas Died: June 27, 2003, Baghdad, Iraq.

Staff Sgt. Brian T. Craig, 27, Houston, Texas, April 15, 2002, Afghanistan

Capt. Eric L. Aliton, 34, Houston, Texas September 26, 2004, Ramadi, Iraq.

Capt. Andrew R. Houghton, 25, Houston, Texas August 9, 2004, Ad Dhuhah, Iraq.

Lance Cpl. Thomas J. Zapp, 20, Houston, Texas November 8, 2004, Al Anbar Province, Iraq.

Cpl. Zachary A. Kolda, 23, Houston, Texas December 1, 2004, Al Anbar Province, Iraq.

Staff Sgt. Dexter S. Kimble, 30, Houston, Texas January 26, 2005, Ar Rutba, Iraq.

Pfc. Jesus A. Leon-Perez, 20, Houston, Texas January 24, 2005, Mohammed Sacran, Iraq.

(Moment of Silence.)

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, we have spent over \$200 billion so far on the war in Iraq. According to the Congressional Budget Office, by 2010, our expenses might be as much as \$600 billion.

The two hundred billion dollars we have spent so far would be enough money to provide health care for the 45 million Americans without health insurance.

That two hundred billion dollars would permit us to hire three and a half million elementary school teachers.

That two hundred billion dollars for the war in Iraq is going on America's credit card and that goes right to the deficit—a debt to be paid by our children and grandchildren.

All this might be worth it if we had something to show for it. I think two hundred billion dollars for peace and democracy is a bargain.

But we haven't gotten peace and democracy. That two hundred billion has bought us: over seventeen hundred dead Americans; an unknowable number of Iraqi civilian deaths; a dysfunctional country that cannot move its political process forward; a new haven and proving ground for anti-American extremism; a wellspring of mistrust from longtime friends and allies around the world; and a devastating erosion of American leadership and credibility.

So what are we still doing there? The President says we are pursuing our "ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world." But the President has dragged onto a path that, at best, muddles that message.

We are building our nation's largest embassy in Iraq; even before it is complete, we have more than 1,000 embassy staff in Iraq. What is the average Iraqi on the streets of Fallujah—or average Jordanian on the streets of Amman—going to think when he sees that

we are building the Largest American Embassy in the World in Baghdad?

I am sure the average Iraqi does not mourn the savage brutality of Saddam Hussein's regime. The question is whether he equates our never-ending American presence in Iraq with a new form of tyranny, rather than the freedom the President says he seeks to spread.

The underlying problem with our endless occupation of Iraq—a country that does not threaten the United States—is that it undermines our leadership on issues that DO threaten the United States. North Korean and Iranian nuclear weapons, global terrorism, emerging deadly international diseases—all these issues are imminent threats that we must confront. Our ability to convince other nations to join us in boldly confronting these threats has been hobbled both by our deceptive entry into Iraq and our lingering departure from it.

Mr. Speaker, our Iraq policy has become a festering wound that bleeds away more and more of America's wealth, America's security, America's leadership, and even America young men and women in uniform. I ask all my colleagues to join me in asking the President seek an exit from this venture at the earliest possible moment.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1282. An act to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to strike the privatization criteria for INTELSAT separated entities, remove certain restrictions on separated and successor entities to INTELSAT, and for other purposes.

ELECTROMAGNETIC PULSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, what I want to spend a few moments talking about this evening is something that will be new to most Americans. They will not have heard about this subject. Indeed, nobody knew about this until 1962; that is, no one in this country knew about it.

There was an experiment over Johnston Island out in the Pacific Ocean that was called Operation Starfish. It was part of a series of nuclear tests that were called the Fishbowl Series. This was a unique one. The others had all been at ground level or some little distance above the ground. This one was an extra-atmospheric, a detonation above the atmosphere.

Nobody knew what was going to happen. It was the first time we had detonated a nuclear weapon in a test series above the atmosphere, and there were a number of ships and airplanes and radar, theater-like, that were tracking the missile that launched this nuclear bomb and noted its explosion. The explosion occurred about 400 kilometers

above Johnston Island. That is well above the atmosphere.

Now, the Soviets have had very extensive experience with this kind of testing. This was our first and, indeed, our only experience with this. So our knowledge about this phenomenon comes from this single test, what we have learned from the Soviets and now the Russians and the number of simulations that we have done since that time.

There were no diagnostics to test the effects on Hawaii, which was about 800 miles away, because nobody expected there to be any effect there. Many of the instruments we were using for testing around Johnston Island were pegged; that is, they did not have enough capacity to register the effects that were produced by this extra-atmospheric explosion.

What happened in Hawaii may be open to some controversy, but there were some lights that went out. This was largely electrical. In those days it was not all of the electronics that we have today. A number of lights went out, and in the last couple of years, some of the evidence of what happened to that equipment was shown to a commission that I will talk about in a little bit that was set up in 2001 to investigate this phenomenon, and they submitted their report in 2004.

This phenomenon that we observed there that exceeded the capacity of the instruments at the test site, that went all the way, 800 miles away, to Hawaii, have been called electromagnetic pulse, EMP. We have learned since then that every extra-atmospheric explosion produces an EMP. You can develop a nuclear weapon, as we designed but as I understand never built and the Soviets both designed and have built, enhanced EMP weapons that limit the explosion but increased the electromagnetic effects.

What are the implications of EMP and why are we talking about it tonight? EMP could be probably the most asymmetric weapon that any adversary could use against us. By asymmetric, we mean a weapon that has a relatively small impact in terms of its local effect but could have an enormous impact on our military or our society because of its effect.

There are a number of asymmetric weapons. Terrorism is an asymmetric weapon. It does not cost them much money or take very big explosives, but it has a big effect on us. 9/11, of course, was a major asymmetric attack on us because those few people in those four airplanes have cost us billions and billions of dollars and totally changed our society. This is an example of an asymmetric attack.

Most Americans will not know about electromagnetic pulse and what it could do to our military, to our society, but I will guarantee my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that all of our potential enemies know everything about EMP. In a little bit, I will show you some quotes from countries that

could be our enemy that will indicate that they know all about EMP.

In 1999, I was sitting in a hotel room in Vienna, Austria. We were there near the end of the Kosovo conflict. There were eleven Members of Congress there, several staff members, three members of the Russian Duma and a personal representative, Slobodan Milosevic. We developed a framework agreement for ending the Kosovo conflict that was adopted 8 days later by the G-8.

One of the Russians who was there was a very senior Russian. His name is Vladimir Lukin. He was the ambassador to this country at the end of Bush I and the beginning of Clinton. At that time he was chair of their equivalent of our Committee on International Relations, a very senior and very respected Russian. He is a little short fellow with short arms and stocky build.

He sat in that hotel room in Vienna for 2 days with his arms folded across his chest, looking at the ceiling. He was very angry. He said at one point, You spit on us; now why should we help you?

What he meant by that was that the United States, the Clinton administration at that time, had indicated to the Russians that they really were not needed to help resolve this conflict, that we were big boys and we would handle this on our own. It soon became obvious to the Clinton administration that the only country in the world that had the real confidence of the Serbs was Russia, and they were added to the G-7 to make the G-8, which 5 days after we came back resolved the Kosovo conflict with the framework agreement that we had developed there.

The statement that Vladimir Lukin made was a startling statement. The chairman of our delegation was the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) who had been to Russia thirty-some times and he speaks some Russian and understands more. When Vladimir Lukin was speaking, he turned to me and said, Did you hear what he said? Yes, I heard what he said, but of course, I did not understand it; I just heard Russian words.

When it was translated, this was what he said, and by the way, he did not need a translator. Vladimir Lukin speaks very good English, but when you are talking with these folks, they frequently will speak in their native tongue so it has to be translated and then translated back to them when we speak so that gives them twice as long to formulate their answer. So if you do not know both languages, you are at somewhat of a disadvantage in dialoguing with them because they have twice as long to formulate an answer.

This was what surprised the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), and this is what he said: If we really wanted to hurt you, with no fear of retaliation, we would launch an SLBM. That's a submarine-launched ballistic missile. We would launch an

SLBM. We would detonate a nuclear weapon high above your country, and we would shut down your power grid for 6 months or so.

Now, he made the observation that without fear of retaliation, because you would not know for certain where it came from, particularly today. Factor in the Cold War with only two superpowers, we absolutely would have known where it came from, but today, how would you know? There are many countries out there who can get a tramp steamer and a Scud launcher and a crude nuclear weapon and that is all it would take to produce an EMP attack because a Scud launcher goes about 180 miles apogee, and that is plenty high. It would not cover all of the United States, of course.

The third ranking Communist was there, a handsome, tall, blond fellow by the name of Alexander Shurbanov, and he smiled and said, if one weapon would not do it, we have some spares. I think at that time it was something like 7,000 spares that they had.

This was a very startling remark, and what it said was that the detonation of a single, large, appropriately designed nuclear weapon above our country could shut down our power grid and shut down our communications, he said, for 6 months or so. If that were true, and there is increasing evidence, as I will indicate, from the report that this commission gave us that it is true, that would mean that you would be in a world, Mr. Speaker, where the only person you could talk to was the person next to you unless you happened to have a vacuum tube handset, then you could talk because they are about a million times less susceptible to EMP than our current microelectronic systems, and the only way you could go anywhere was to walk.

Several years ago, we had a field hearing at Johns Hopkins University applied physics lab, and a Dr. Lowell Wood was there. I met Dr. Lowell Wood through Tom Clancy who lives on the eastern shore of Maryland and I know him. He has come to do several political events for me. I knew that he had done a book where EMP was a part of the scenario, and I knew he did very good research and he could tell me something about EMP. This was several years ago.

I called Tom Clancy and I asked him, and he said, gee, if you read my book you know all about EMP that I know, but he said let me refer you to the smartest man hired by the U.S. government. He referred me to a Dr. Lowell Wood from Lawrence Livermore Laboratory in California. We got his pager number. In those days it was pagers rather than cell phones that are so ubiquitous today, and I paged him, believing that he was in California. The pager signal went up to a satellite and back down, and he was in Washington, and within an hour, he was sitting in my office.

Dr. Lowell Wood at this field hearing out at the applied physics lab out in

Howard County made the observation that an EMP lay down would be the equivalent of a giant continental time machine that would move us back a century in technology. What this would mean, of course, is that we would have no more capability for moving around, for communicating to each other, for plowing our fields, for moving our equipment and our food around than we had 100 years ago.

I said that, Dr. Wood, the population we have today, 285 million people and its distribution, largely in large cities and suburbia, could not be supported by the technology of a century ago. His unemotional response was, Yes, I know.

□ 2130

The population will shrink until it can be supported by the technology. The point I am trying to make is this could be a devastating asymmetric weapon. It may not be known to most Americans. I suspect not one in 100 have heard of nuclear electromagnetic pulse, but I can assure Members that all of our potential enemies know a great deal about EMP.

The first chart shows the effects of a single nuclear weapon. This one is detonated in the northwest corner of Iowa, and it blankets all of the United States.

The colors here indicate the intensity of the pulse you get from that. The purple as you can see from the scale is 50 percent. So what this says is whatever the intensity was at ground zero, and we are several hundred miles above that, but the intensity at that level which is the red here in the center, will be half that out at the margins of our country.

This little smile here and the distortion here is due to the magnetic field of the Earth that bends the electrons that I will describe in just a moment.

What is this electromagnetic pulse? It is produced from strong gamma rays from the nuclear explosion which produce electrons that move at the speed of light. They move now to everything within line of sight. If you are about 3 or 400 miles high over the center of the country, Iowa or Nebraska, that will blanket all of the United States.

If the voltage is high enough, it will disrupt or fry these microelectronics.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to work on the inside of your computer, you need to be very careful that the static electricity that you produce just by rubbing your clothes together will not damage it. You need to put a little wrist band on and ground yourself. At factories where most of these computers are made, and it is almost all women that I have seen there, this is one area where women do it better than men, and they are grounded to the floor. They have a metal anklet on, and they are grounded to the floor because static from just their movement could damage these very sensitive, very tiny microelectronics.

A little later I will show a chart that says the interview with some Russian generals have indicated that they have weapons that can produce 200 kilovolts per meter. They told us, and I cannot tell Members the exact voltage to which we have harkened, but I can say that the Russian generals told us they believe that this signal was several times higher than the voltage to which we had hardened. And even out at the periphery with 50 percent degradation, it was higher than we had hardened. By "hardening" I mean we have put some buffers in there that would intercept this pulse, like the surge protectors that we have for our computers which we have for lightning which will do no good for EMP because this pulse has such a rapid rise time measured in nanoseconds.

This pulse will be through the surge protector before the protector sees it. If you are 200 kilovolts at ground zero, it is 100 out at the periphery, and that is probably enough to weld, to fry all of our microelectronics, which is why Vladimir Lukin said they would detonate a nuclear weapon high above our country, shut down our power grid and our communications for 6 months or so.

From chart 2, I want to give some quotes from potential enemies to indicate that I am not letting the genie out of the bottle this evening. They know all about it. Not one in 50 Americans may know about EMP, but I want to assure Members our potential enemies know all about EMP.

This first quote is the quote that I heard myself sitting in that hotel room in Vienna, Austria when Vladimir Lukin said they could shut down our power grid and our communications. That was May 2, 1999. There were 10 other Congressmen there and several staff members.

Chinese military writings describe EMP as the key to victory and describe scenarios where EMP is used against U.S. aircraft carriers in a conflict over Taiwan. It is not like our potential enemies not only know about it. And they know that we know about it, so they feel free to put it in their public writings.

A survey of worldwide military and scientific literature sponsored by the EMP commission was set up, and they functioned for 2 years. They submitted a report and they are now continuously briefing additional entities, different organizations and people. They found widespread knowledge about EMP and its potential military utility, including in Taiwan, Israel, Egypt, India, Pakistan, Iran, and North Korea. Iran has tested launching a scud missile from a surface vessel, a launch mode that could support a national or transnational terrorist EMP attack against the United States.

By the way, we thought that launch was a failure because the device was detonated before it reached land. Now, that is exactly what you would do if you were rehearsing an EMP attack.

By the way, there is no way that a nuclear weapon could do anywhere near as much damage against a sophisticated country like ours by dropping it on one of our cities as you could do to our country by detonating it at altitude. And you would not know it happened unless you were looking at it.

We are totally immune to EMP. It will not hurt us or damage buildings. All it does is to knock out all of our microelectronics, which means all of our computers. For instance, your car has several computers. Indeed, if you have a new car, they cannot even work on it in a shop without hooking it up to a computer to tell what is wrong with the vehicle. So an EMP with a high enough pulse would fry the computers in the car. They would not run. If you happen to have an old car with a coil and a distributor, that is probably going to work. That is probably less susceptible to EMP.

This chart shows additional quotes: "If the world's industrial countries fail to devise effective ways to defend themselves against dangerous electronic assaults, they will disintegrate within a few years. 150,000 computers belong to the U.S. Army. If the enemy forces succeed in infiltrating the information network of the U.S. Army, then the whole organization would collapse. The American soldiers could not find food to eat nor would they be able to fire a single shot." This is from Iranian Journal, December 1998.

"Terrorist information warfare includes using the technology directed energy weapons or electromagnetic pulse." This is from Iranian Journal of March 2000.

Terrorists have attempted to acquire non-nuclear radio frequency weapons. These are the weapons that would produce the directed energy effect. These produce a similar kind of pulse to EMP but does not have the broad spectrum. It only has part of the frequency involved. But if intense enough, if set up in this room, for instance, it could fry the computers in the cloak room which is not that far away. If it was set up in a van and went down Wall Street, if it were a really sophisticated device, it could take out all of the computers there, which would shut down our trading for quite a while if they were all taken down.

Some people might think that things similar to a Pearl Harbor incident are unlikely to take place during the Information Age. And this is a writing from China. Yet it could be regarded as a Pearl Harbor incident of the 21st century, if a surprise attack is conducted against the enemy's crucial information systems of command, control, and communication by such means as EMP weapons. Even a superpower, China says, like the United States, which possesses nuclear missiles and powerful armed forces, cannot guarantee its immunity. In their words, an open society like the United States is extremely vulnerable to electronic attacks. This is May 14, 1996 from a Chinese journal.

Iran has conducted tests with Shahab-3 missiles which have been described as failures. I mention that because they detonated it before it reached the ground. That is exactly what they would do if they were planning for an EMP attack. Iran Shahab-3 is a medium-range mobile missile that could be driven onto a freighter and transported to a point near the United States for an EMP attack.

By the way, an EMP laydown is always an early event in Chinese and Russian war games because it is the most asymmetric attack that they could lodge against our country.

Just a little bit of a time line here. Operation Starfish occurred in 1962. In 1995, there was a very interesting event that nearly started World War III. It has been written up in several books now. Most people never knew about it, but the Norwegians launched an atmospheric test rocket. They are fairly close to Russia, and they told the Russians that they were launching this rocket; but in the bureaucracy of Russia, that did not get communicated to the right people and when they launched it, it was interpreted as a first salvo from the United States. You do not have very long to respond if your enemy is about a half hour away in terms of these ballistic missiles. The Russians came very near to launching a major salvo of missiles with nuclear warheads on them against our country. This was a very narrow brush with destiny that tells us how important it is that we understand the potential of these weapons and how they could be misunderstood by an enemy.

In 1997, I sat in a hearing here on Capitol Hill and General Marsh was there. He was the general in charge of the President's Commission on Critical Infrastructure. He was looking at the critical infrastructure of our country and its vulnerability to enemy attack. I asked him if he had looked at EMP. He said, yes, he did. Well? Well, the commission thought there was not a high probability there would be an EMP attack, so they had not considered it any further.

My observation to that was, Gee, if you have not already, I am sure when you go home tonight you are going to cancel the fire insurance on your home because there is not a very high probability that your home will burn.

When you have an event like a potential fire in your home or an EMP attack, which is a very high-impact, but low-probability, event, that is just the kind of an event that you purchase insurance to protect you from. It is unlikely to happen; but if it happened, it would be so devastating you would need insurance to cover that.

Mr. Speaker, what we need is the equivalent in our country of the insurance policy that you bought on your home. We need to make an investment in the equivalent of an insurance policy so we will be able to anticipate if we can survive an EMP attack.

□ 2145

In 2001, we had some very interesting tests at Aberdeen with a directed energy weapon that was put together. This was really interesting, because we asked these engineers to put together the kind of a weapon that terrorists might put together if they were buying equipment only from Radio Shack. So they went to places like Radio Shack and they bought the equipment and they put it together in this van that could go down the street and it was kind of camouflaged so it was not sure what it was and this directed energy weapon had the ability to take out microelectronic equipment at considerable distance from it.

In 2001 because of my concerns about the potential for EMP, I had put in the authorization that year legislation that set up a commission to look at this eventuality. The next chart shows the commissioners that were on this. These are all very well known people. The first person that heads the list there is Dr. Johnny Foster who is the father of most of our modern nuclear weapons. He is the Edward Teller of today. Another one of our commission members, Dr. Lowell Wood that I have mentioned already, kind of inherited the mantle of Edward Teller. There were several other people. They had nine people altogether. Dr. Bill Graham who chaired it was the deputy chair of the emerging ballistic missile threat that was chaired by Donald Rumsfeld before he was the Secretary of Defense. Dr. Bill Graham has been the presidential science adviser. He has held a lot of very high posts. He is really very well known. Commissioner Richard Lawson was a USAF general, served on the Joint Chiefs of Staff and was Deputy Commander in Chief of the U.S.-European Command. The last member listed here, Dr. Joan Woodard, I had a very interesting experience with her. I did not remember the names of all the commission members and they had just been set up a little while and I went out to Albuquerque, New Mexico, to visit my son who works there in the laboratory. He brought home from the lab a little internal report that they were passing around that indicated to me that they might have some expertise at the lab there that would be useful in the work of the commission. And so I asked to have a briefing on it and, big surprise, Dr. Joan Woodard was one of the commissioners and she had been working for several months and had a number of her staff working with her and I had a 5-hour classified briefing on the potential effects of EMP not just on our military because they were spending most of their time on our national infrastructure. So we had this body of real experts that was working for 2 years. Ordinarily a commission works for 1 year. This one worked for 2 years and brought forth a big report. They are still writing, I think, the third volume of this report. They have now briefed the House, they have briefed

the Senate, they are briefing a lot of key people. A lot more people are now knowing something about EMP and its potential effects.

What I want to do now in the next four charts, and we will look at this next one now, I want to quote directly from the EMP commission report. This is the EMP commission report that was Public Law 106-398, title 14. This was the law that set up this commission and all of this is from their report.

Over at the left of this chart, Mr. Speaker, you see the effects of an extra-atmospheric detonation above our country and the concentric circles there show the range that would be covered by detonations at different altitudes. You see you need to get up about 300 miles high, that is about 500 kilometers, before it covers all of the United States. These are direct quotes from the commission:

EMP is one of a small number of threats—indeed, I do not know any other threat—EMP is one of a small number of threats that may, one, hold at risk the continued existence of today's U.S. civil society. We need to put that in everyday kitchen language, Mr. Speaker. What they are saying is that this would end life as we know it in the United States. Let me read it again in their carefully couched language: Hold at risk the continued existence of today's U.S. civil society. If, Mr. Speaker, this EMP attack really did what Vladimir Lukin said it would do and that is to shut down our power grid and our communications for 6 months or so, if the only person you could talk to is the person next to you and the only way you could go anywhere was to walk, I think it is very obvious that that would end life as we know it in this country. Hold at risk, they say, the continued existence of today's U.S. civil society. Also, it has the power to disrupt our military forces and our ability to project military power. That is because, Mr. Speaker, for the last decade, more than the last decade, we have been waiving EMP hardening on almost all of our weapons systems. You see, when we had so little money to buy weapons, particularly during the Clinton years when they called it a build-down, I called it a teardown of the military, we could get a few more percent weapons systems that cost somewhere between 1 percent and 10 percent to harden, so you could get 1 percent to 10 percent more weapons systems if you did not harden, and so they just ran a calculated risk that we would not need the hardening. But, Mr. Speaker, the time when we are really going to need these weapons is when we are at war against a peer, and there will be a peer, a resurgent Russia or a China of the future and the first thing they are going to do, they say so in their writings, they say so in their war games, the first thing they are going to do is an EMP laydown which will then deny us the use of all of our military equipment which is not hardened. I am not sure why we are building it, we do

not need it, to defeat countries like Iraq. We will really need it to defeat a peer and if it is not hardened, then it will not be available to us.

The number of U.S. adversaries capable of EMP attack is greater than during the Cold War. Yes, that is true. There was one then, the Soviet Union. Now there are a whole bunch. Let us try Iran if it gets a weapon, North Korea, India, Pakistan, a number of countries that are today our friends, England and France and Israel and the list goes on.

Quotes again from the commission, not my quotes. Potential adversaries are aware of the EMP's strategic attack option, obviously from what Vladimir Lukin said and you can glean that from their writings. The threat is not adequately addressed in U.S. national and homeland security programs, and that is a gross understatement. It is not only not adequately addressed, it is hardly addressed at all.

The second chart is again quotes from the EMP commission and we have redacted some names here. I am not sure the Russian generals would want the world to know who they were, but these are the two Russian generals that I mentioned. They claim that Russia has designed a super EMP nuclear weapon capable of generating 200 kilovolts per meter. I cannot tell you what we hardened to, but I can tell you that the Russian generals believe that this is several times the level to which we have hardened. Chinese, Russian, Pakistani scientists are working in North Korea and could enable that country to develop an EMP weapon in the near future. This is not my statement, Mr. Speaker. This is a direct quote from the EMP commission.

The next chart shows additional quotes from the EMP commission. States or terrorists may well calculate that using a nuclear weapon for EMP attack offers the greatest utility. Indeed, if they had a single weapon, taking out Los Angeles, San Francisco, New York, Philadelphia, Washington would have nowhere near the effect on our society as simply taking out all of our computers.

EMP offers a bigger bang for the buck against U.S. military forces in a regional conflict or a means of damaging the U.S. homeland. Again, these are not my words. These are quotes from the EMP commission.

This is a really interesting one. EMP may be less provocative of U.S. massive retaliation compared to a nuclear attack on a U.S. city that inflicts many prompt casualties. Even, Mr. Speaker, if we knew where it came from, if all they have done is take out our computers, are we justified in incinerating their grandmothers and their babies? Maybe we should respond in kind and take out all the computers in North Korea. I doubt that very few people in North Korea would care that we took out all their computers. This, Mr. Speaker, is really a very asymmetric attack because if we responded

in kind, there are none of our enemies that are anywhere near as vulnerable as we are and some of them could hardly care less if we took out their computers and the few that the military has could easily be hardened if they were anticipating that they might need them hardened.

Strategically and politically, an EMP attack can threaten entire regional or national infrastructures that are vital to U.S. military strength and societal survival, challenge the integrity of allied regional coalitions, and pose an asymmetrical threat more dangerous to the high-tech West than to rogue states. Indeed, if we responded in kind, it would really be an asymmetric attack, because they would be little affected by taking out their computers since they little depend on their computers.

Technically and operationally, EMP attacks can compensate for deficiencies in missile accuracy, fusing, range, reentry. Suppose they are really lousy in the kind of missiles they have, their aim is very poor. If they missed the target by 100 miles, Mr. Speaker, it really does not matter. One hundred miles is as pretty much as good as a dead hit because 100 miles away really will not make that much difference in the very large areas that are covered by this EMP attack.

Terrorists could steal, purchase or be provided a nuclear weapon for an EMP attack against the United States simply by launching a primitive Scud missile off a freighter near our shores. We would have, Mr. Speaker, 3 or 4 minutes' notice. Scud missiles can be purchased on the world market today for less than \$100,000. Al Qaeda is estimated to own about 80 freighters. So what they need is \$100,000 to buy a Scud missile and a crude nuclear weapon that who knows where they might get that. Maybe some Russian scientist who has not been paid for 4 or 5 years.

Certain types of low-yield weapons can generate potentially catastrophic EMP effects. These are the enhanced EMP weapons that the Soviets, the Russians, have developed. Mr. Speaker, we have every reason to believe that these secrets are now held by China. There is no reason to entertain the thought that they do not have these secrets. And if China has them, who else has them? I think the safest thing to assume is that any potential enemy has them.

The last chart from the commission shows a very interesting little schematic on the right which shows the interrelationships of our very complex infrastructure. This was commented on a number of years ago by a scientist at Cal Tech who held a series of seminars called The Next 100 Years. He was theorizing, could we indeed recover from something, he did not know about EMP, so he was talking about a nuclear war, because he noted that we had developed a very interconnected, complicated infrastructure where one part depended on another part and we

developed that from a base of high quality, readily available raw materials, oil that almost oozed out of the ground at Oil City, Pennsylvania, coal that was exposed by a heavy rain when the dirt was washed off, iron ore in the central part of our country that was such high quality that you could almost smelt it in a backyard smelter. Indeed, there is one of those, you can drive up and see it just south of Thurmont on Route 15. It is called Cactoin Furnace and they denuded the hills up there to produce coke to make iron there. You see here a very interrelated infrastructure. The point they are making is that if one part of that comes down, suppose you do not have electric power, they have not drawn all the arrows they should have drawn because you are not going to have oil or gas, you are not going to have communications, you are not going to have water, you are not going to have banking or finance, you are not going to have government services, you are not going to have emergency services, you are not going to have transportation without electricity. So if you take down just that one thing, everything comes down. Of course, if you do not have any banking services, pretty soon everything will grind to a halt because they will not have the finances to keep the thing going.

One or a few high altitude nuclear detonations can produce EMPs simultaneously over wide geographic areas. Again, I am quoting from the commission. Unprecedented catastrophic failure of our electronics-dependent infrastructure could result. I think that you should almost put the verb in there, Mr. Speaker, would result. You may have noted in the paper just today, I think, or yesterday, there was an account that we almost had another big blackout, just almost tripped that big blackout and there is no catastrophic insult like an EMP laydown to cause that. Power, energy, transport, telecom and financial systems are particularly vulnerable and interdependent. We just talked about that, very vulnerable, lots of computers, very interdependent. One goes down and they all come down. EMP disruption of these sectors could cause large scale infrastructure failures for all aspects of the Nation's life.

□ 2200

Both civilian and military capabilities depend on these infrastructures. Without adequate protection, recovery could be prolonged months to years.

What would happen if that was prolonged months to years?

Increased dependence on advanced electronic systems results in the potential for an increased EMP vulnerability of our technologically advanced forces, making EMP probably the most attractive asymmetric weapon. EMP threatens the ability of the United States and Western nations to project influence and military power. We could be easily blackmailed by a country that has the

ability to produce an EMP laydown if we are not prepared to protect ourselves from it.

Degradation of the infrastructures could have irreversible effects on the country's ability to support its population, and this one brief three-word sentence, "millions could die." That is what Dr. Lowell Wood said when I asked him how could the technology of a century ago support our present population and its distribution. And his unemotional answer was, "Yes, I know. The population will shrink until it can be supported by the technology." That shrink could easily, easily, Mr. Speaker, be in the millions or hundreds of millions of people.

There are two other charts that I want to show the Members, and this is what other people are saying. This is from an op-ed piece by Senator JOHN KYL, and I am delighted that Senator KYL is helping with spreading the word about this and the caution that we really need to be doing something. This was in *The Washington Post*, and he says: "Last week the Senate Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Homeland Security, which I chair," this was JOHN KYL, "held a hearing on a major threat to the United States not only from terrorists but from rogue nations like North Korea. An electromagnetic pulse, EMP, attack is one of only a few ways that America could be essentially defeated by our enemies, terrorists or otherwise. Few if any people would die right away, but the long-term loss of electricity would essentially bring our society to a halt. Few can conceive of the possibility that terrorists could bring American society to its knees by knocking out our power supply from several miles in the atmosphere, but this time we have been warned and we better be prepared." And this is his comment.

Another comment here, and this is from the *Washington Times* and just a couple of brief paragraphs here. This is from Major Franz Gayl: "The impact of EMP is asymmetric in relation to our adversaries. The less developed societies of North Korea, Iran, and other potential EMP attack perpetrators are less electronically dependent and less specialized while more capable of continued functionality in the absence of modern convenience."

That is an easy way to say they are not dependent upon computers like we are and we would suffer a whole lot more than them. And then in the next paragraph he pointed out that because of our enormous complexity, how technologically developed we are, that our great strength has become potentially our great weakness when we are talking about EMP.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to close with some observations. Again, from the commission's report, the EMP threat is one of a few potentially catastrophic threats to the United States. By taking action, the EMP threat can be reduced to manageable levels.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the EMP Commission report is really a good-news story. One would not think it was good news pointing out how very vulnerable we are, but the good news is that we now know how vulnerable we are, and we know that this is fixable; and it is fixable for far, far less cost than the Iraq war. We just need, Mr. Speaker, to do it. It is not going to happen overnight. It is going to happen quicker in our military than in our private sector because we turn over our weapons programs quicker than we turn over our big transformers and our power grid and so forth. But we can little by little, year by year, fix our national infrastructure and fix our military so that we are not as vulnerable.

Mr. Speaker, being vulnerable like this, and I pointed out comments from the writings of a number of our potential enemies, it is not that they do not know this. Not one person in 50 in the United States will know it, but it is very obvious that all of our potential enemies know about this. Our very vulnerability invites that attack. Because we are so vulnerable, because it is so asymmetric, we invite that attack. Mr. Speaker, we need to do everything we can to lessen the probability of attack. And the longer we go unprotected from EMP, the more we invite this attack and the more vulnerable we are. U.S. strategy to address the EMP threat should balance prevention, preparation, protection, and recovery.

We have been talking primarily, Mr. Speaker, about prevention, about hardening, so that those pulses will not get through so that it will not fry the equipment and our infrastructure can keep working. There are a number of things we need to do in preparation.

One of the things we need to do is to have the equivalent of the old civil defense. In our homeland security we really are not looking at civil defense. Those who are my age and maybe a little younger but mostly my age can very well remember all those fallout shelters, and the young people may have noticed some of those rusting signs and wondered what they were because there were fall-out shelters almost everywhere a generation ago.

In the 1950s, IBM was lending their employees money interest-free to build backyard shelters. We were expecting the potential of a bolt out of the blue, that nuclear weapons would be rained down on us. And there were brochures put out by the government telling us how to build a fall-out shelter, what to put in the fall-out shelter, what we needed to buy. EMP is not going to be anywhere near as hard to protect ourselves against as a nuclear explosion and all that fall-out. But to the extent that each of us and our families and our communities are prepared for this, our country is going to be enormously stronger should this happen to us.

And, Mr. Speaker, whether one is preparing for an EMP attack or for a terrorist attack or anything that disrupts our usual economy, we have

about 3 days' supply of food in any one of our big cities. If the trucks do not keep coming, the supermarket may be open 24 hours a day, but when we are in there, Mr. Speaker, we are going to see that as we are taking it off the shelf, they are stocking the shelves. This goes on continually because there are only about 3 days of food. What would happen if our trucks could not run? What would our cities do after those 3 days after the food was gone? It is very easy, Mr. Speaker, to stock far more than 3 days of food in one's house.

A number of years ago, there was a very well-known economist by the name of Howard Ruff. He had made some predictions about the stock market that made him kind of an icon in his day, and people would come to him for advice. And a very interesting story, when they came with their money and said, How should we invest our money Mr. Ruff, he would say, Do you have a year's supply of food for your family? They would say, No. He would say, If you do not have a year's supply of food for your family, you do not have any money to invest. The first thing you need to do is buy a year's supply of food for your family, and then come back and we will talk about how to invest the rest of your money because that is the best investment that you need to make.

They would come back, and he would say, You have a year's supply of food? Yes, sir.

Well, he said, do you have a bag of silver?

A bag of silver is a bag of junk silver and one may do something else but they need the equivalent of this. That is junk silver. It is silver that has no numismatic value, and it is in bags that are sealed and they have a \$1,000 face value. He said, Unless you have a bag of silver for each member of your family, you have not made the second most important investment you could make; so go buy that and come back and we will talk about what to do with the rest your money.

These are the kinds of things that Americans need to be thinking about. What can they do, Mr. Speaker, what can their family do, what can their church group do so that they are not going to be a liability on the society should there be a terrorist attack that shuts down these services or should there be a national EMP attack that shuts them down all over our country? We can do something, Mr. Speaker, to prepare ourselves so that we are going to have some sense that we can make it through so that we are not going to be a liability on the system.

Let me show the last chart here now in our conclusion. The fiscal year 2006 defense authorization bill contains a provision that extends the EMP Commission's life to ensure that their recommendations will be implemented. We want them watching to see what we are doing. We want them to tell us and to tell the public. We are a representative government here; and when our

people call in and say, Are you doing this, are you doing that, my wife points out that if we do not represent our constituents, we will not represent our constituents. So if the people across our country demand that we be prepared, that we tell them how to be prepared themselves, then we will do this.

The terrorists are looking for vulnerabilities to attack, and our civilian infrastructure is particularly susceptible to this kind of an attack. Our very vulnerability invites this attack. Mr. Speaker, we obviously cannot do it yesterday. We certainly need to do it today and tomorrow to begin to protect ourselves against it.

The Department of Homeland Security needs to identify critical infrastructures. What are the first things, Mr. Speaker, that we need to turn our attention to? Where would a minimal investment pay the biggest dividends? And we need to have people studying this. The EMP Commission has made a lot of very good suggestions. If we simply followed those suggestions, we would be a long way to where we need to be. The Department of Homeland Security also needs to develop a plan to help citizens deal with such an attack should it occur, and then the little note that our citizens need to become as self-sufficient as possible.

Mr. Speaker, we have spent the better part of an hour talking about something that one might expect to see in a science fiction movie or in some magazine that is talking about the improbable. But what we are talking about here is a very possible, and I think probable, event. It is something that the American people have not been very much aware of. We hope that this awareness, as the EMP Commission continues its work, will be more widespread. We hope that the American people will respond by doing two things: one, demanding that their government, that their Representative make the right kinds of choices and appropriate the right kinds of moneys to start on the path to developing a military that is immune to EMP attacks and to, as quickly as possible, develop a national infrastructure that will not collapse like a house of cards with an EMP attack. And, also, I believe that our citizens will demand that we tell them what they can do.

There is an interesting phenomenon, Mr. Speaker. If in anticipation of a hurricane this fall, one goes to the grocery store now and stocks up on some things that they need, they are going to be a patriot because they are improving the economy. If they wait until the hurricane is on its way and then they go to the store to stock up on what they need, they are no longer a patriot. They are now a hoarder. So exactly the same act is really a very good act or a very bad act depending upon when they do it. If they buy it in long anticipation of the event, they are now a real patriot. They are providing some assurance that they will not be a liability

and they are helping the economy. If they wait until the threat is at their door and they now buy it, now they are a hoarder and nobody wants a hoarder. So our homeland security needs to help us to know what we need to do so that we will be as self-sufficient as possible, an asset and not a liability.

Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that to be forewarned is to be forearmed. I know that probably not even one in 50 Americans has ever heard of EMP, but I will assure the Members that all of our potential enemies know all about EMP. We see it in their writings. We see it in their war games. And what we need to do, Mr. Speaker, is to proceed as rapidly as we can to develop a military that is immune to EMP, to develop an infrastructure that as quickly as possible will be less and less damaged by EMP, and to provide each American citizen with the information they need so that they, their family, their social club, their church, as individuals, as families, as groups, can plan so that they will be as self-sufficient as possible in whatever emergency occurs.

And who knows what the terrorists might do to us. This is clearly the most devastating, the most asymmetric attack that could be made on our country; but there could be lesser ones that could for one's family, one's locality be just as devastating as an EMP attack.

Mr. Speaker, I know the American people will respond and know when our enemies see us responding that the risk of this kind of attack will be immensurably lessened because the less vulnerable we are, the less likely they are to attack.

□ 2215

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of the Special Order today by the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness in the family.

Mr. CARTER (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today after noon and June 22 on account of official business.

Mr. CONAWAY (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today after 2:30 p.m. and June 22 on account of attending the funeral of a fallen soldier who was killed in Iraq.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of business in the district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, June 28.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today and June 22.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, June 23.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, June 22.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today and June 22.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1282. An act to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to strike the privatization criteria for INTELSAT separated entities, remove certain restrictions on separated and successor entities to INTELSAT, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on June 21, 2005 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 483. To designate a United States courthouse in Brownsville, Texas, as the "Reynaldo G. Garza and Filemon B. Vela United States Courthouse".

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 22, 2005, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2428. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel (Banking & Finance), Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Terrorism Risk Insurance Program: Additional Claims Issues; Insurer Affiliates (RIN: 1505-AB09) received June 10, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1492. A bill to provide for the preservation of the historic confinement sites where Japanese Americans were detained during World War II, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109-142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REGULA: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 3010. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 334. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2985) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes (Rept. 109-144). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WAXMAN (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. OBEY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BACA, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EMAN-

UEL, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GORDON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. KIND, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REYES, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABO, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STARK, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WATT, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, Mr. WYNN, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. CASE):

H.R. 3003. A bill to establish an independent Commission to investigate detainee abuses; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. HAYES, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. UPTON, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. DOYLE):

H.R. 3004. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to analyze and report on the exchange rate policies of the People's Republic of China, and to require that additional tariffs be imposed on products of that country on the basis of the rate of manipulation by that country of the rate of exchange between the currency of that country and the United States dollar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. HOYER):

H.R. 3005. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the expansion, intensification, and coordination of the activities of the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute with respect to research on pulmonary hypertension; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HOLT, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. LEE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. SABO, Mr. FARR, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PASTOR, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WEINER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. STARK, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 3006. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide a mechanism for United States citizens and lawful permanent residents to sponsor their permanent partners for residence in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HART:

H.R. 3007. A bill to combat terrorism financing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLE of Oklahoma:

H.R. 3008. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide for the making of foster care maintenance payments to private for-profit agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 3009. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to enable veterans to transfer from a State veterans home in one State to a State veterans home in another State, on a space-available basis, without a waiting period with respect to establishment of State residency; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. AKIN (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. FOX, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. MACK, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. McHENRY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. OTTER, Mr. PAUL, Mr.

PEARCE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RENZI, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. SODREL):

H.R. 3011. A bill to establish certain requirements relating to the provision of services to minors by family planning projects under title X of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 3012. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income health care subsidy payments made to employers by local governments on behalf of volunteer firefighters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 3013. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain Forest Service administrative sites in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 3014. A bill to amend the Act of August 9, 1955, regarding leasing of the Moses Allotments; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 3015. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2 benzylthio-3-ethyl sulfonyl pyridine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 3016. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on carbamic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 3017. A bill to provide certain requirements for the licensing of commercial nuclear facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KIND, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SABO, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. McDERMOTT):

H.R. 3018. A bill to amend the Hmong Veterans' Naturalization Act of 2000 to eliminate the application deadlines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMSTAD (for himself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. McNULTY):

H.R. 3019. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the consolidation of life insurance companies with other companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H. Res. 335. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of a National Epidermolysis Bullosa Awareness Week to raise public awareness and understanding of the disease and to foster understanding of the impact of the disease on patients and their families; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 336. A resolution requesting that the President focus appropriate attention on neighborhood crime prevention and community policing, and coordinate certain Federal efforts to participate in "National Night Out", which occurs the first Tuesday of August each year, including by supporting local efforts and community watch groups and by supporting local officials, to promote community safety and help provide homeland security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. PICKERING and Mr. CANNON.
H.R. 47: Mr. JINDAL and Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 69: Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 111: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. DELAHUNT.
H.R. 147: Mr. KIRK.
H.R. 156: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 478: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 557: Mr. CANNON.
H.R. 558: Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 565: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 594: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 595: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 687: Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 689: Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 698: Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 709: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 759: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 818: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 819: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 822: Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 831: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 874: Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 881: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 897: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 920: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 934: Mr. DENT.
H.R. 998: Mr. BOEHLERT.
H.R. 999: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1010: Mr. LINDER.
H.R. 1059: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1105: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 1120: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 1132: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1175: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1188: Mr. SALAZAR, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1245: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1246: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. BEAUPREZ, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 1248: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.
H.R. 1272: Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 1298: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 1337: Mr. McCOTTER and Mr. GILLMOR.
H.R. 1345: Mr. HULSHOF.
H.R. 1370: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1402: Mr. McNULTY.
H.R. 1449: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.
H.R. 1461: Mr. McCOTTER and Mr. ADERHOLT.
H.R. 1468: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 1474: Mr. CLEAVER and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1520: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1587: Mr. RYUN of Kansas.
H.R. 1588: Mrs. MCCARTHY and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 1591: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 1600: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 1602: Mr. POE and Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan.
H.R. 1607: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. McCOTTER.
H.R. 1615: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. McCOTTER.
H.R. 1634: Mr. MORAN of Kansas and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 1649: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 1696: Mr. FOSSELLA and Mr. DOGETT.
H.R. 1791: Mr. MEEK of Florida.
H.R. 1816: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 1898: Mr. KLINE, Mr. KELLER, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1952: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania and Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1973: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2051: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 2071: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2193: Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 2209: Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 2238: Mr. TERRY, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2308: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 2327: Ms. WATERS, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 2389: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 2423: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 2456: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 2498: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KUHL of New York, and Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 2533: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 2617: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2640: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 2680: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 2682: Mr. FORD.

H.R. 2730: Mr. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 2746: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2747: Ms. HARRIS.

H.R. 2793: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2794: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 2802: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 2804: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 2828: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 2834: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. CASE.

H.R. 2872: Mr. LEACH, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. LEE, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 2876: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mrs. MCCARTHY, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 2877: Mr. COOPER and Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 2891: Mr. OWENS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 2959: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. REYES.

H.J. Res. 43: Mr. GOODE.

H.J. Res. 53: Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. KLINE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 55: Mr. FARR, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. LEACH.

H. Con. Res. 69: Mr. McCOTTER.

H. Con. Res. 128: Mr. ROHRBACHER and Mr. BERMAN.

H. Con. Res. 145: Mr. MANZULLO.

H. Con. Res. 178: Mr. GOODE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. CASTLE.

H. Con. Res. 181: Mr. TERRY.

H. Res. 17: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. BASS.

H. Res. 299: Mr. MICHAUD.

H. Res. 312: Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H. Res. 313: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 317: Mr. KIND.

June 21, 2005

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H4897

AMENDMENTS

H.R. 3010

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to carry out section 1860D-1(b)(4) of the Social Security Act.

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY: MR. DEFAZIO

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: